

**A
LAWYER
EXAMINES
THE BIBLE**

A DEFENSE OF THE
CHRISTIAN FAITH
BY IRWIN H. LINTON

Foreword by Tim La Haye

DICK SERVATI
"77"

Library of Tim Servati

Donated by his uncle,
Rev. Richard Servati

A LAWYER EXAMINES THE BIBLE



A Lawyer Examines the Bible

A Defense of the Christian Faith

Irwin H. Linton

Foreword by Tim LaHaye

BAKER BOOK HOUSE
Grand Rapids, Michigan

© 1943 by Baker Book House Company
Paperback edition issued 1977
ISBN: 0-8010-5565-2

Printed in the United States of America

This book is dedicated to
MY WIFE
whose charming Christian companionship
has so greatly cheered my
earthly pilgrimage.

FOREWORD

The hardest decision I ever had to make was whether I should be a lawyer or a minister. However, the Holy Spirit had placed the apostle Paul's burden on me, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel," and it has been an exciting twenty-eight years in the ministry, for which I have no regrets. Nevertheless, I have always had a strange fascination for the legal profession.

That probably explains why I bought Irwin H. Linton's book, *A Lawyer Examines the Bible*, the first time I saw it and proceeded to read it through, late into the night. During the past twenty years I have given a copy of the book to many confused young people who were searching for answers to questions posed by unbelieving and skeptical professors. I am happy to report that many found the answer they sought and are now actively serving the Lord.

Lawyers tend to be among the most probing and analytical people in our society, at least on matters of faith. Irwin Linton was a good lawyer, and he most convincingly presents the case for the supernaturalness of Christianity. Lawyers are taught to make decisions only after studying both sides of a case. I am convinced that those who reject the claims of Christ don't know both sides, for the real evidence is all in favor of the Christian faith. What makes scoffers out of many in our culture is, in most cases, simply lack of exposure to the evidence. This book will confront the reader with the compelling reasons for believing in Christ and the inspiration of the Bible.

Mr. Linton, who practiced law in Washington, D.C., and appeared before the Supreme Court of the United States, is persuasive and thorough in his presentation of the evidence for Christianity. And one doesn't have to be a lawyer to understand him!

Tim F. LaHaye, President
Christian Heritage College

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

I. ADDRESSED ESPECIALLY TO LAWYERS	13
II. OPENING THE CASE	26
III. THE FACTUAL FOUNDATION	36
IV. FACING THE EVIDENCE	41
V. ON GETTING CONVERTED	60
VI. GETTING CONVINCED	73
VII. FACING DIFFICULTIES OF BELIEF	81
VIII. LAYING TWO GHOSTS	91
IX. PERSUADING OTHERS	98
X. PERSUADING OTHERS (CONTINUED)	105
XI. MEN WHO WERE CONVINCED	116
XII. GIVING THE INFIDEL A HEARING	127
XIII. CALLING MARK HOPKINS TO THE WITNESS STAND	140
XIV. THE BUSINESS OF LIVING	150
XV. THE BUSINESS OF DYING	167
XVI. "SUMMING UP"	192
APPENDIX "A"	200
APPENDIX "B"	204
APPENDIX "C"	206
APPENDIX "D"	213
APPENDIX "E"	217
APPENDIX "F"	221
APPENDIX "G"	229

CONTENTS

APPENDIX "H"	262
APPENDIX "I"	298
CONSECRATION DEED	287
BIBLIOGRAPHY	288

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

"WHAT hath the Lord spoken" asked Balak of Balaam (Numbers 23:17) from whom he hoped to secure supernatural aid in blocking the invasion of his land by the horde of ex-slaves from Egypt. "How many times shall I adjure thee that thou say nothing but the truth to me in the name of the Lord" said Ahab to the prophet Micaiah (2 Chron. 18:15) when he heard what he wanted to hear but doubted that it was really word from the Lord. Longing for word from the Lord has been the greatest ache and hunger of humanity ever since God discontinued his evening visits to Adam and Eve in the Garden. Have we any word from the Lord?

Lucretius,¹ Democritus and the atheists of all the ages have answered this question "No, for there is no God to speak it." Herbert Spencer has expressed the belief of the agnostics to the effect

¹ Though Lucretius disclaims atheism.

that even if there be a god he must forever remain unknown and unknowable. Socrates didn't know the answer and said that we could only know the truth in this matter from a messenger from heaven "And how I long to see that Man."

On the other hand from the time of the priests of Egypt and Babylon men have made capital of this heart-hunger for a word from the Lord and secured reverence and revenues from their fellow mortals by declaring that God (or the gods) had spoken and that they were the exclusive custodians of his word. "God is God and Mahomet is his prophet" chants the Mohammedan. "Great is Diana of the Ephesians" shouted her priests at Ephesus.

If any of these claims is well founded it would be folly not to avail ourselves of the guidance offered from this tortured earth to a blissful heaven.

History, however, is so filled with the false claims of mere mortals seeking the prestige and profits of being recognized as vested with divine authority that it is hard not to share the feelings at least of the great agnostic Hume who, while admitting that the logic of his contention that the "uniform presumption" against any miracle can never be overbalanced by any weight of evidence whatever for it has a conceivable exception, fraud and superstition have so befuddled human thinking and befouled human history that any allegation of a supernatural event, or miracle, if proffered as support for any religion or priestly claims should be disgustingly rejected.

And any rationally skeptical man should demand "strict proof" before submitting his thinking and doing to the authority of any other man, as millions do, or to any book as is done by millions more. There is a place for skepticism as well as a place for faith; and in considering an investment or embracing a religion skepticism should come first. "Leave faith behind"—to paraphrase Dante—"all ye who enter" upon the *inescapable* exercise of "private judgment" in selecting a book or a pope or a patriarch or a Mormon prophet as our infallible guide to heaven or in neglecting the matter altogether. Any man or system which shrinks from or even discourages investigation is *ipso facto* suspect. To give faith, except in routine matters where a *prima facie* presumption and experience support it, to any man or system which merely demands it is not faith but credulous folly. The Bible, does not discourage rigid investigation of its claims but invites it: "Come now, let us reason together" the Lord is repre-

sented as saying. "Search the Scriptures, for they testify of me" said Christ. "Prove all things, hold fast to that which is good" writes Paul. If any man or book really has God's wisdom and authority as support he or it will invite and stand the most rigid examination. If our study leads us to reject these claims we had better face the fact that we have no "word from the Lord," endure our loneliness and desolation as best we can, try not to blow our brains out, as an overworked prominent lawyer friend of mine did a few days ago, and do our best "not to shudder too much when the light goes out." Though Pope is so often quoted "Where ignorance is bliss tis folly to be wise," the starkest fact is preferable to the fairest illusion. Mark Hopkins wrote that a great deterrent to Christian belief is the very fact that the hopes and assurance of it are so glowing that sad and disillusioned humanity is apt to reject them because "too good to be true." From many years of experience and observation I believe that the most joyous and morale-building experience possible is the discovery that Christianity's proofs are as overwhelming as its prospects and promises; that Christian faith is not a thing desperately to be clung to (often in spite of intellectual doubts and protests) like a life ring thrown to a drowning man, but may be as a result of investigation such an established conviction as to become like a strapped-on life belt with its inescapable security. To doubt is not sin, but to be contented to remain in doubt when God has provided "many infallible proofs" to cure it, is. "I count only that man rational who loves God with all his heart because he has found Him or else seeks Him with all his heart because he has yet found Him not," wrote Paschal. I have never known lawyer or judge who has not been convinced by the proofs merely needing consideration that in the Bible we have verily "word from the Lord."

And what a good word it is! It has all the answers:

"Where did we come from?" "How is it that things exist at all?"

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

"What is the matter with us?" "Why do we act and suffer so?"

"By sin came death."

"Is there any hope for us?"

"The Seed of the Woman shall come and crush Satan's head and give back the Paradise *Adam lost*."

"If a man die shall he live again?"

"Thy dead men shall rise." "Awake and sing ye who sleep in the dust of the earth." "He that believeth in me though he were dead yet shall he live."

"Is there any other world than this one?"

"I go to prepare a place for you." "In My Father's House are many mansions." "Thine eyes shall see the King in his beauty; they shall behold the land that is very far off."

"How can a man be just with God?"

"Christ is the end of the law for righteousness for everyone that believeth."

And this purported "word from the Lord" sets forth the most thrilling drama ever written: of the Only Potentate, King of kings and Lord of lords, who made the heavens and the earth "the stars also," whose mightiest prince and satrap, Lucifer, Light-bearer, the Son of the Morning, unable to bear the power entrusted to him, seduced a whole province of the "Great King's infinite domain, to wit the Earth," "the sorrowful star," into rebellion against Him, and of the campaign under the leadership of "Prince Immanuel"¹ not only to subdue and imprison Satan and his hosts, but to win back His rebellious subjects to a passion of loyal devotion to Him.

In Genesis, the first act of the great drama of redemption, the actors come upon the stage: God, Adam and Eve, Satan, and the promised "Seed of the woman": God, He "who is, who was and is to come," the Something or Someone who always must have been, else nothing would be now; the Power behind the electrons, which are behind the atoms, the "E" in Einstein's tendered equation of the power involved in the sustention of any given amount of the matter of which we and our universe consist: "Energy equals mass multiplied by the square of the speed of light."

Adam, the triune being of body, soul and spirit, endowed with the essential but dangerous power of self-direction.

"God created a prodigious thing
Of strange ingredients.
He made it free to disobey
And charged obedience.
A hy-bred creature half divine
With Satan's inclinations.

¹ Bunyan's "Holy War."

He put it in a proving ground
 And beset it with temptations.
 He made with it a covenant
 To countermand the tomb
 And placed within its facile reach
 Eternity and doom.

Incredible phenomenon
 Whose basis was the dust
 Whose heritage was purity
 Whose tendency was lust.
 Presumptive heir of paradise
 Marked for the Devil's clan
 A masterpiece, a paradox
 Imponderable man."²

Adam, the first of uxurious husbands who united with his wife in disobedience to the divine law, which must be kept inviolate to preserve such an intricate universe as this from chaos, and in poisoning with the death virus the stream of life which flowed from them; then the promise of the mysterious Being, the Seed of the Woman, who would come at the dramatically right moment of the climax of man's misery to "crush Satan's head." In this first act light and life and love and beauty and joy and all good things are introduced—and RUINED. "By sin came death." The plot is outlined, and we read about one patriarch after another of whom, after many weary centuries of life, the record says "and he died." Like a minor refrain, a symphony pathétique; "and he died," "and he died," and the last word in this tragic first act is "A coffin in Egypt." "So Jacob died and was buried in a coffin in Egypt."

Then, skipping about in the book and omitting Enoch and Noah and Nimrod and Tubal Cain and other tremendous characters, some sons of God and some of the Devil and some of them possibly miscegenating angels, there come on the stage Abraham and Sarah, his wife, whose beauty got him into so much trouble that one remembers the old adage "He is never without care who has a beautiful wife or a castle in Spain"; this couple who in the matters of Hagar and Abimelech seem to us deficient in that normal jealousy which God evidently intended to serve the purpose of preserving the sanctity of the marriage relation: Abraham the "Father of Nations" and Sarah the "Mother of Kings," with intriguing minor charac-

² *Saturday Evening Post*, author *Mildred Luton*.

ters such as Rahab, Ruth and Bathesheba, ladies of unascetic lives, graciously incorporated by the "Coming Prince" in his very family tree, as illustrative of his later fully manifested chivalrous, utterly forgiving attitude toward the womankind in which he had united such love and devotion, frailty and faithfulness.

And the tremendous character of Moses, "the friend of God" who talked with him face to face until the skin of his face shone and he had to wear a veil to avoid scaring his people to death as he dealt with them; Moses who so bitterly complained of the "yellow" ex-slaves from Egypt who whenever the going got hard longed for their former slavery because with it they had plenty of fish and onions and leeks and garlic to eat (I wonder how many miles to leeward the breath of that host could be smelt) and protested that he had "not begotten all these people" and as the clamor of their united wails ("each man in his tent door") arose "Meat, meat, we want meat," the meek and patient Moses quoted Job and anticipated Jonah and was craven enough himself to ask God "to slay him out of hand." But how this Moses warmed God's heart by his loyal defense and petition for these people, "your people" said God, "no your people" said Moses, when God more than once offered to make an end of them and start all over again with Moses' descendants—from which we can learn that a sure way to win God's favor is never to bring a railing accusation against fellow Christians—the Devil will do that—but to defend their good names and beseech God's pardon for them. Moses whose life over-towers human history as the pyramid Cheops does the Egyptian horizon and whose death for failure to honor God in bringing water from the rock established the precedent by which we can know that the Christ whose whole career was filled with words and deeds infinitely transcending the presumption of Moses, if he were not divine, was indeed the "One greater than Moses" who was to come, even the One with whom he talked on Sinai. But who would not be glad to share Moses, death if he might have a similar burial?

"By Nebo's lonely mountain
On this side Jordan's wave,
In the vale in the land of Moab
There lies a lonely grave.
But no man built that sepulchre,
And no man saw it e'er.

For the angels of God upturned the sod
And laid the dead man there.

That was the grandest funeral
That ever passed on earth
And no man heard the trampling
Or saw the train go forth,
But noiselessly as the daylight
Comes when the night is done
And the crimson streak on the ocean's cheek
Grows with the rising sun.

Perchance the old bald eagle
On gray Beth-Peor's height
Looked down from his rocky eyrie,
And saw that wondrous sight.
Perchance the lion stalking
Still shuns that hallowed spot
For beast and bird have seen and heard
Things which man knoweth not.

Noiselessly as the spring-time
Her crown of verdure weaves
And all the trees on all the hills
Unfold their thousand leaves.
So without sound of music
Or voice of them that wept,
Silently down from the mountain's crown,
The great procession swept.

But when the warrior dieth,
His comrades of the war,
With arms reversed and muffled drums
Follow the funeral car;
They show the banners taken;
They tell his battles won,
And after him lead his masterless steed,
While peals the minute gun.

Amid the noblest of the land
Men lay the sage to rest
And give the bard an honored place
With costly marble dressed,
In the great minster transept
Where lights like glories fall,
And the sweet choir sings and the organ rings
Along the emblazoned wall.

This was the bravest warrior
 That ever buckled sword;
 This the most gifted poet
 That ever breathed a word,
 And never has earth's philosopher
 Traced with his golden pen
 On the deathless page truths half so sage
 As he wrote down for men.

And had he not high honor?
 The hillside for a pall!
 To lie in state, while Angels wait,
 With stars for tapers tall!
 And the dark rock pines, like tossing plumes
 Over his bier to wave,
 And God's hand, in that lonely land,
 To lay him in the grave.

In that strange grave without a name,
 Whence his uncoffined clay
 Shall break forth—oh wondrous thought!
 Before the judgment day,
 And stand with glory wrapped around
 On the hills he never trod
 And speak of the strife that won our life
 With the incarnate Son of God.

Oh lonely tomb in Nebo's land!
 Oh dark Beth-Peor's hill!
 Speak to these anxious hearts of ours
 And teach them to be still.
 God hath his mysteries of grace
 Ways that we cannot tell,
 He hides them deep, like the secret sleep
 Of him he loved so well."

Cecil Frances Alexander

Many centuries later there comes on the stage David with his sling and his giant, our Lord's many times great grandfather according to the flesh: tense, hot-hearted, loving, lovable, obedient, serving, sinning, repenting, singing, groaning David who received at the Lord's hand more than double—and in kind—for all his sin against Uriah and Bathesheba—unless she were in the plot—and who wrote the record of his crime and the horror it involved him in, and his Psalms to warn and encourage and keep from despair and suicide

other sinners, and the history of God's gracious dealings in forgiving and restoring to him the peace and joy which he feared were gone forever.

Then the princely, scholarly Daniel appears, the great premier of the great Nebuchadnezzar, who held his mad monarch's throne empty and open for his return for seven long years (one of greatest feats in history) and whose ability and utter integrity were so manifest from the record and manner of this fearless man that his services as premier were taken over by the kings who conquered Babylon. Daniel who received a special delivery message by an angel that he was "greatly beloved" at the high court of heaven and was then told the exact day when the Messiah—the Eden-foretold Seed of the Woman—should appear on earth and incidentally fulfill the promise that Zerubbabel's plain little temple's glory would excel all the gold and marble of Solomon's because "The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly appear in it," bringing to mind Blaise Pascal's epigrammatic statement that: "The time of Messiah's first coming was definite; the circumstances were obscure. If both time and circumstances had been definite, there would have been no obscurity even for the wicked" (some of whom were in ignorance of his identity to slay him). "The time of Messiah's second coming is obscure; the circumstances are definite. If neither time nor circumstances were definite, there would be obscurity even for the righteous." And Malachi tells us where the coming Hero was to be born and Isaiah the strange and incongruous and almost unbelievable fate that was to befall him "and the glory that should follow."

And so every book in this Old Testament part of this drama contributes in advance its identifying feature and line to the majestic Figure looming ever nearer and clearer through the mist of then future history until the prewritten biography of the Coming One is complete and all who later recorded what was said and done in their presence by the one whom John proclaimed when he said "Behold the lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world" and all who read their records since can know of a certainty, by checking the history with the prophecy, that He it was that was to come and that they need not "look for another."

How dramatically the Old Testament record of man's creation and sin and need for and promise of a redeemer ends with Malachi's "word from the Lord" that he would send "Elijah the prophet be-

fore the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord," to rectify the great evil of absence of affection between fathers and sons (and surely by implication the guilt and alienation of men's affection from the Heavenly Father) "lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." And during the awesome silence and suspense of over four centuries this contingent judgment overhung the earth, to be averted if at all only by God's promised interposition. How dramatic this foreboding, minor chord or ending—like that of Bach's Toccata and Fugue—as a prelude to the joyous crash of major chords of news from heaven when the angels had their one and only opportunity to have a part in Foreign Missionary work. Proclaimed the angel:

"Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." (Kurios, Jehovah Himself) "Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace" (instead of Malachi's warning of pending judgment) "good will toward men"—not to men of good will, but God's merciful good will, since He had sent the promised Redeemer and Atoner, to all men good and ill. "God has kept His Eden promise," the angels sang in effect. "The Messiah has been born. You will find Him wrapped in swaddling clothes and lying in an ox's feed box, an ass's hay rack!" And connecting the direful words of a suspended judgment concluding the Old Testament with the joyous announcement of the New, we read that the angel Gabriel (who must know a lot of Bible verses or else memorized this one from Malachi for the occasion) in announcing to Zacharias that he was to father Messiah's promised forerunner incorporated the substances of this verse in his message: ". . . and thy wife Elizabeth shall bear thee a son . . . and many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God, and he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord." (Luke 1:13-17)

Then, after a full account of Christ's birth and early childhood there is another divinely decreed silence as to his adolescence. The rests in a musical composition, the omissions in a narrative, are as important as the notes and events in producing the effect; and here we have an illustration of supernatural restraint as well as inspiration of the Gospel writers. These silences are contrary to human desire and curiosity.

Witnesses Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, James and Jude wrote records in their martyr's blood of the things Christ the Messiah said and did during the three and a half years of his association with them in accomplishing the feat of crushing the head of the mighty Serpent Satan, to fulfill his promise to the woman and her husband in Eden; of his death and they thought utter defeat in the struggle, until He actually came back from the dead and explained everything to them during the month and more that He lingered on earth with them before ascending before their eyes into heaven. And the great drama of Paradise Lost and Regained ends with John's glorious revealing of the identity of the God who walked with them as a Man as he saw him in the background of the heavenly court where he left word for us, we are invited to join him soon.

This glorious eternity of existence with the King in a royal palace with the New Jerusalem for a home and stars and their planets for exploring visits is to begin with a great banquet and wedding feast to which all are invited—just so they send in their acceptance in time. It is a formal affair: the marriage feast of the Prince of Glory. We are all invited and all will be welcomed who heed the request accompanying the invitation: "R.S.V.P." *Répondez s'il vous plaît*. On Easter Monday the grounds of the President's "White House" are open for all who care to wander in and out for "egg rolling." It is not thus with this great event. Only those who have accepted and so notified the Kingly Host will be admitted. Not a "place card" but a solitaire diamond¹ with a secret name of endearment is to be prepared and presented to each guest. And since reception at this marriage feast is to involve adoption into the royal family, as when the King of England raised Arthur Wellesley to the rank of Duke of Wellington there was set aside a princely estate to maintain him in his new dignity, so Christ cheered his followers, when He warned them of the woes which would result from their serving Him, "I go to prepare a place for you." Possibly after dinner each guest will be escorted by his "guardian angel" and other delightful and vivacious angelic beings to see his heavenly mansion and gardens—and all this is freely offered in the Gospel!

Christ illustrated the graciousness of this invitation to "take of the water of life freely" and become immortal by the parable of the king who sent forth his servant to go into the "highways and hedges"

¹ "White stone," Revelation 2:17.

(the habitat of tramps and "bums" from that time to this) and be so insistent in asking them to join him at his prepared banquet that he used the word "compel them to come in." We will cleave close to reality if we imagine a King's herald spying a tramp by the roadside warming a can of beans over a small fire and hailing him:

"Ho sirrah! you are invited to dinner at the royal palace. The King is giving a marriage feast to his Son and his friends."

"Are you talking to me?"

"Yes to you."

"Some mistake. No king invites the likes of me to dinner at the palace. I am 'Dusty Dick,' the bum."

"You are invited, no matter who you are."

"Some catch in it. Guess they want to get me up to headquarters to compare my thumb prints; and I ain't done a thing."

"No matter what you have done or haven't," answers the herald; "the King has issued a 'proclamation of amnesty' and full pardon for all offenses, even that of treason, and has authorized me to assure all that if we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

"But, herald, I am not fit to come. I am dirty. Haven't had a bath since I ran away from home five years ago."

"Yes, Dusty Dick, you are dirty all right; but 'there is a fountain filled with blood drawn from Immanuel's veins, and sinners plunged beneath that flood lose all their guilty stains.'"

"But I haven't anything to wear."

"Each guest as he leaves the bath is supplied with a 'wedding garment,' the garment of Christ's 'imputed righteousness.'"

"But it is a long way and I don't know how to get there."

"'I am the way, the truth and the life' the King's Son has said, 'No one comes to the Father but by me' and 'He that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out.' And He has prepared a book for each pilgrim which serves as a compass to a sailor. Just keep your eye on it and you can't go wrong."

"But the way to the heavenly court is hard and dangerous and against all the traffic and every man's hand is against those going the opposite way. And I ain't as good a fighter as I used to be."

"The King has provided a 'bodyguard' for you, a mighty even if invisible angel. 'Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to minister to those who are the heirs of salvation.' Your guardian

angel won't let any more happen to you than is good for you. Yes, you will have a chance to do some good fighting on your journey, But, hoot mon, what is better than a good fight?"¹

"What have I got to fight with? my bare fists?"

"Put on the whole armor of God. He has provided a sword, helmet, breastplate (for your front; never let the enemy see your back), greaves to protect your shins and sandals. And if you get some wounds you will prize the scars of them when you get to heaven above all you have."

And so God deals with poor sinners in urging them to accept the infinite blessing and felicity He offers us. "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ; as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God; for He hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin that we might become the righteousness of God by him."

Hear how grand old Matthew Henry presents the matter and manner of this imperial invitation:

"The guests are called upon; for in the gospel there are not only gracious proposals made, but gracious persuasives. We persuade men, we beseech them in Christ's stead. 2 Cor. v; 11,20. See how much Christ's heart is set upon the happiness of poor souls! He not only provides for them, in consideration of their want, but sends to them in consideration of their weakness and forgetfulness. When the invited guests were slack in coming, the king sent forth other servants, v 4. When the prophets of the Old Testament prevailed not, nor John the Baptist, nor Christ himself, who told them the entertainment was almost ready (the kingdom of God was at hand), the apostles and ministers of the gospel were sent after Christ's resurrection to tell them it was come, it was quite ready; and to persuade them to accept the offer. One would think it had been enough to give men an intimation that they had leave to come and should be welcome; that during the solemnity of the wedding the king kept open house; but because the natural man discerns not, and therefore desires not, the things of the Spirit of God we are pressed to accept the call by the most powerful inducements, drawn with the cords of a man and all the bonds of love.

If the repetition of the call will move us, Behold the Spirit saith Come; and the bride saith Come; let him that heareth say Come; let him that is athirst come. Rev. xxii; 17. If the reason of the call will work upon us, Behold the dinner is prepared, the oxen and fatlings are killed, and all things are now ready. The Father is ready to accept of us, the Son

¹ This herald was Scotch-Irish.

to intercede for us, the Spirit to sanctify us; pardon is ready; peace is ready; comfort is ready; the promises are ready, as wells of living water for supply; ordinances are ready, as golden pipes for conveyance; angels are ready to attend us; creatures are ready to be in league with us; providences are ready to work for our good, and heaven at last is ready to receive us; it is a kingdom prepared, ready to be revealed in the last time. Is all this ready and shall we be unready? Is all this preparation made for us and is there any room to doubt of our welcome if we come in the right manner? Come therefore, O come to the marriage feast we beseech you; receive not all this grace of God in vain. 2 Cor. vi;1."

It is believed that the only thing—beside neglect and procrastination—that can keep a sane man from accepting this invitation and exchanging the wrath of God for the love of God, with all the glorious corollaries connected with a transfer from the position of a condemned criminal to that of a son and object of the affection and delight ("His delights are with the sons of men") of One infinitely able to create and bestow happiness, is the casually accepted belief that Christianity is not a miraculous reality but mere legend, tradition and fable concocted by fellow mortals—a mirage generated by the heart-hunger of humanity for the peace and joy and beauty which it ever fails more than transitorily and tantalizingly to possess.

The proofs of the direct opposite were declared to be "astounding" by a scientifically educated retired government engineer who was not long ago induced to consider the contentions and the quotations in this book from the great 18th Century apologists for Christianity; and some years ago I was informed of the conversion of a retired 80-year-old judge who had so late in life by this book been induced for the first time to study the evidence of the reality of the eternal issue he had almost neglected to settle in time.

This being a lawyer's examination of the Bible it would seem apropos for this foreword to quote a few sentences from recent confessions of his Christian faith by the late Lord Caldecote, Lord Chief Justice of England, for the purpose of suggesting that a conviction reached by so distinguished a jurist should not, at least, be dismissed as unworthy even of consideration.

"My faith began with and was founded on what I thought was revealed in the Bible. When, particularly, I came to the New Testament, the Gospels and the other writings of the men who had been friends of Jesus Christ seemed to me to make an overwhelming case, merely as a matter of strict evidence, for the facts therein stated. . . . The same

approach to the cardinal test of the claims of Jesus Christ, namely, His Resurrection has led me as often as I have tried to examine the evidence to believe it as a fact beyond dispute. . . . But this is not the time for examining the evidence (this statement is the result of my examination of the evidence) and I must simply say in the words of the Creed: 'I believe in Jesus Christ . . . who rose again from the dead.' "

All who share this belief—and it is believed that all by the grace of God may—can face serenely life and death and all that they bring.

I

ADDRESSED ESPECIALLY TO LAWYERS

"If a close examination of the evidences of Christianity may be expected of one class of men more than another, it would seem incumbent upon us [lawyers] who make the law of evidence one of our peculiar studies. Our profession leads us to explore the mazes of falsehood, to detect its artifices, to pierce its thickest veils, to follow and expose its sophistries, to compare the statements of different witnesses with severity, to discover truth and separate it from error."

THUS wrote Simon Greenleaf, the greatest authority known to England and America on the subject of legal evidence, in dedicating to the members of the bar his great but up to recently almost forgotten work, "The Testimony of the Evangelists." It is because the subject of the Christian Evidences has proven both to me and to scores whom I have interested in it the most interesting, satisfactory, thrilling and informing encountered in a lifetime of study, that I make this appeal to anyone not familiar with it to address himself to it forthwith. I urge upon my fellow lawyers especially that they give themselves at least once before they die the benefit of their own skilled professional services in examining, by every acid test known to the law, the evidence and reasoning in support of the formally recorded opinions of many of the most famous members of our learned and skeptical profession that a thing proved beyond a reasonable doubt is the claim of the Christian religion and the Holy Bible to be in deed and in fact the one religion and book with the inspiration and sanction of Almighty God behind them.

Legal scrutiny is the last thing to which any form of imposture is willing to submit, courts and their officers being especially skilled and daily exercised in its exposure; and yet it is investigation at the hands of men of this profession that Christianity especially courts and from which it uniformly emerges triumphant.

There is deep significance in the fact adverted to both by the evangelist Charles G. Finney, and by David Nelson, the author of the famous old book, "Nelson on the Cause and Cure of Infidelity."

Writes David Nelson, long an infidel doctor, later a Christian minister:

"I do not know why it is so, but it is the result of eighteen years experience that lawyers, of all those with whom I have examined, exercise the clearest judgment while investigating the evidence of Christianity. I am unable to account for the fact, yet so it is, that the man of law excels. He has when examining the evidence of the Bible's inspiration shown more common sense in weighing proof and appreciating argument, where argument really existed, than any other class of men I have ever observed."

And, confirming this statement of Dr. David Nelson, we find the most famous of all evangelists, Charles G. Finney, writing as follows:

"I have always been particularly interested in the salvation of lawyers, and all men of the legal profession. To that profession I was myself educated. I understood pretty well their habits of reading and thinking, and knew that they were more certainly controlled by argument, by evidence and by logical statements than any other class of men. I have always found, wherever I have labored, that when the Gospel was properly presented, they were the most accessible of men; and I believe it is true that, in proportion to their relative number in any community, more have been converted than of any other class. I have been particularly struck with this, in the manner in which a clear presentation of the Law and the Gospel of God will carry the intelligence of judges, men who are in the habit of sitting and hearing testimony and weighing argument on both sides. I have never, to my recollection, seen a case in which judges were not convinced of the truth of the Gospel, where they have attended meetings, in the revivals which I have witnessed. I have often been very much affected, in conversing with members of the legal profession, by the manner in which they would consent to propositions to which persons of ill disciplined minds would have objected. . . .

". . . Indeed, as a general thing, they take a more intelligent view of

the whole plan of salvation than any other class of men to whom I have ever preached or with whom I have ever conversed."

We have before us here a phenomenon for which a "reasonably prudent man" will seek an explanation.

Why should it be that the one class of men whose lives are largely spent in the work of sifting and weighing evidence about disputed matters, trained by their profession "to explore the mazes of falsehood, to detect its artifices, to pierce its thickest veils, to follow and expose its sophistries, to compare the statements of different witnesses with severity, to discover truth and separate it from error," should be the very class of men who, after such dubious scrutiny as it becomes a lawyer's second nature to bestow upon any proposition, are surest to assent to the Bible's claims to divine inspiration and its presentation of Jesus Christ as the very incarnate, crucified, resurrected Son of God? Is not the answer strongly suggested: Because Christianity is true "in manner and form as alleged"?

But is the opinion of a lawyer or the whole profession of the law particularly valuable in regard to matters so abstruse as religion, morals, theology and life in another world? Would not the view of a master of some of the more abstract sciences be more significant: the metaphysician, psychologist, physicist, biologist, physician or the like? Gentlemen of these professions are frequently called upon to take the witness stand as "experts" in court trials, and some of their most famous members will testify to the disintegrating effect of skilled cross-examination at the hands of able lawyers, whose profession leads them to study at one time or another almost all branches of knowledge.

I am not minimizing but rejoicing in the firm faith in Christianity and testimony to it of great scientists of all branches of research, from Newton to Lord Kelvin and our recently deceased famous Christian brother in the Lord Dr. Howard A. Kelly; but it seems to me that most significant is the fact that of all learned callings, it is the followers of that profession which gives the keenest ability to detect imposture and unproven claims, who most promptly, firmly and universally, when they bring to consideration of the matter their training and skill, ac-

cept the Bible as truly the inspired word of God and the Christ as the divine Son of God.¹

The lawyer does indeed deal more with facts than with theology and philosophy, but one of the fundamental and blessed facts about the Christian religion is that it is a (and the only) *fact based religion*. In distinction from all other and false religions and isms of the world, which rest on unverifiable theories, assumptions, postulates and chains of syllogisms, each often using as a major premise a very poorly established conclusion of the previous one, our Christian faith, with its glad assurance of a rapturous resurrection and life after death, rests on definite, historical facts and events—facts and historical events of such nature that if they really took place, the religion is true, and established by so direct, so strong and so great a variety of independent and converging proofs that it has been said again and again by great lawyers that they cannot but be regarded as proved under the strictest rules of evidence used in the highest American and English courts.

We have, then, the well-reasoned opinions of that profession and class of men most skeptical and skilled by training to discern falsehood and imposture that the Christian religion, presenting ponderable, factual proofs, is neither, but is what it purports to be.

True, there have been many lawyers of this and other days infidel or agnostic. But their legal training gives their views no value unless their attention has seriously been given to a consideration of this matter. And it may safely be believed of all infidel lawyers that no one of them has ever made a careful, lawyer-like, two-sided investigation of the claims of the "Bible and its Christ," studying and digesting any of the great "briefs" or works on the "Christian Evidences" which gather together and sum up the proofs in support of the claim of the Lord Jesus Christ to deity and of the Bible to divine inspiration. I have never found one, and I have hunted for twenty-five years.

¹ William James once expressed himself: "When you defer to what you suppose a certain authority in scientists as confirming these negations, I am surprised. Of all insufficient authorities as to the total nature of reality, give me the 'scientists' from Munsterberg up or down. Their interests are most incomplete. Their only authority at large is for method."—"Life and Letters of William James," Vol. II, p. 270.

I have never read of one and I have studied this matter for thirty-five years. And in the last twenty years I have more than once, with no result, challenged large audiences to produce any man, lawyer or layman, who was an unbeliever who had ever read even one of the old classics on the Christian Evidences. I have sometimes followed this inquiry for an instructed unbeliever by the statement that "if you do not believe the Bible, I know what you do believe. You believe in evolution," and then I have asked if there were present a man or woman who believed in this theory who had ever read a single one of the scholarly works against it—still without ever finding one such man or woman.

Surely we have here another phenomenon to be accounted for!

But the general statement that legal training coupled with an investigation of the Bible's proofs practically always results in Christian conviction should be fortified by some examples, and the first I would cite is Sir Matthew Hale, the great Lord Chancellor under Oliver Cromwell. I have a priceless copy of his book "Contemplations Moral and Divine," which was one of the few volumes in the library of George Washington's father. We find inscribed on the fly-leaf of the volume at Mt. Vernon first the name of "Jane, Butler, her book," then this name struck out, apparently by the hand of her successor in Augustine Washington's affections, Mary Ball, the mother of George, who substituted her own name as owner, and probably read this book assiduously to her son, to his great edification. The profound Christian faith and piety of this great English lawyer and his ability to express theological as well as legal matters with force and precision make this old volume, with its f-like ss, worthy of any man's careful study; but the one poem in the book will suffice to make clear the piety of this lawyer whose fame is second to none in the annals of English law:

"CHANGES AND TROUBLES"

Peace wayward Soul! let not those various storms,
Which hourly fill the World with fresh Alarms,
Invade thy Peace; nor discompose that Rest,
Which thou maist keep untoucht within thy Breast,
Amidst those whirlwinds, if thou keep but free
Thy Intercourse betwixt thy God and thee.

The Region lies above these Storms: and know
 Thy thoughts are earthly, and they creep too low,
 If these can reach this, or access can find,
 To bring or raise like Tempests in thy Mind.
 But yet in these disorders something lies,
 That's worth thy notice, out of which the Wise
 May trace, and find that just and Powerful Hand,
 That secretly, but surely doth Command
 And Manage these distempers with that skill,
 That while they seem to cross they Act his Will.
 Observe that Silver Thred, that Steers and bends
 The worst of all disorders, to such Ends,
 That speak his Justice, Goodness, Providence,
 Who closely guides it by his Influence.
 And though these Storms are loud, yet listen well,
 There is another message that they tell:
 This World is not thy Country; 'tis thy Way;
 Too much contentment would invite thy stay
 Too long upon thy journey; make it Strange
 Unwelcome News, to think upon a Change:
 Whereas this rugged entertainment fends
 Thy thoughts before thee to thy journey's end;
 Chides thy desires homeward; tells thee plain,
 To think of resting here it is but vain;
 Makes thee to set an equal estimate,
 On this uncertain World, and a just rate
 On that to come: It bids thee wait and Stay,
 Until thy Master calls, and then with joy
 To entertain it. Such a Change as this
 Renders thy Loss, thy Gain; improves thy Bliss.

That poem with which Sir Matthew Hale comforted his heart in his days of distress has a message for us in ours!

Somewhat earlier we have John Selden, a Christian equally famous as a lawyer, and a scholar so profound that it is said the learned men who gathered together under the auspices of King James to produce that priceless gift to the English-speaking world, the "King James Version" of the Scriptures, were wont to refer to John Selden for solution many problems of translation confronting them as their work progressed.

In our own day we had Sir Robert Anderson, both a lawyer and the head of "Scotland Yard," knighted by Queen Victoria for his services along lines that called for the utmost skill in "exploring the mazes of falsehood . . . in discovering truth

and separating it from error." The meticulous care and acid cross-examination with which he tested the Bible appear on every page of his numerous works, such as "The Coming Prince," "The Silence of God" and others. The reader is referred to Appendix "A" for a sample of his method, and an illustration of the amazing, to-the-day accuracy of Bible prophecy, as this accuracy is demonstrated by this great lawyer-detective, with the aid of the British Astronomer Royal, G. B. Airy.

Lord George Lyttleton, who played an important part in English politics during the reign of George II and was Chancellor of the Exchequer until his lack of aptitude for figures caused him to resign, contended in a work to which Dr. Samuel Johnson declared "infidelity has never been able to fabricate a specious answer" that "the conversion and apostleship of St. Paul alone, duly considered, is of itself sufficient to prove the truth of Christianity," a thesis that the arguments he brings forth make clear.

The scholarly work of Gilbert West, Esq., in showing the real harmony and probative force of the various accounts of the resurrection of Christ is often mentioned in connection with that of Lord Lyttleton, as Lyttleton was much moved to his investigation of the foundations of Christianity by the deep conviction West had formed as the result of his own research. Lyttleton's great work was written at a time when his heart was breaking over the impending death of his wife and, as Cowper exclaims, "How readily does affliction make us Christians"—or at least incline us to that serious consideration of eternal issues which are often neglected in times of health and prosperity.

The death of Abraham Lincoln's little son is said to have been a contributing cause to his investigation of the proofs of Christianity which resulted in his conversion. Up to his fortieth year, though "a great reader of the Bible," he was an agnostic and deist. About that time Dr. James Smith, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Springfield, Ill., gave him to read his own work on the Christian Evidences called "The Christian's Defense," with the result that, in the words of Dr. Smith, "at the conclusion of his examination he came forth, his doubts scattered to the winds and his reason convinced by the arguments in support of the inspired and infallible authority of the Old

and New Testaments—a believer in God, in His providential government, in His son, the way, the truth and the life.”¹ However one’s political views may chance to differ from those of Lincoln, all recognize in his inaugural addresses and constant humble expressions of faith in God the reality of his Christian faith and conversion.

Daniel Webster, the force of whose intellect so showed in his face that a sculptor once working on his bust was accosted by a friend with the remark that he observed he was sculpturing the head of Olympian Jove, wrote a confession of his faith from which the following paragraphs are taken:

“I believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the will and word of God.

“I believe Jesus Christ to be the Son of God. The miracles which he wrought [note that he does not indicate the slightest deficiency in the evidence supporting them] establish in my mind his personal authority and render it proper for me to believe whatever he asserts. I believe, therefore, all his declarations, as well when he declares himself the Son of God as when he declares any other proposition. And I believe there is no other way of salvation than through the merits of his atonement.

“I believe that things past, present, and to come are all equally present in the mind of Deity; that with him there is no succession of time nor of ideas; that, therefore, the relative terms past, present and future, as used among men, cannot with strict propriety be applied to Deity. I believe in the doctrines of foreknowledge and predestination as thus expounded. I do not believe in those doctrines as imposing any fatality or necessity on men’s actions or infringement of free agency.”

The most famous members of the English and American bars have shared Webster’s Christian faith. I have said that I doubted whether a single infidel lawyer had ever read a work on the Christian Evidences and I am almost as confident that very few believing lawyers have failed to follow a law-trained man’s inveterate habit of “studying the other side” and obeying the old Latin injunction “*Audi et alterem partem.*” An *ex parte* consideration of any question is unworthy the name, and the fact that so many of the famous Christian lawyers have not only adopted their views as a result of careful study of the arguments for both infidelity and Christianity, but have written

¹ “Abraham Lincoln the Christian,” by Wm. J. Johnson, pp. 51-2.

notable books (as in the case of Lyttleton, as well as Greenleaf, Lord Erskine, Sir Robert Anderson and many others) in support of their convictions, lends special value to their conclusions. But Christianity does not at all rely upon authority for its support, and lawyers themselves regard lightly mere *obiter dicta* and unreasoned opinions, valuing and weighing the reasoning behind judicial decisions as the thing of real value in every precedent. Christianity offers and asks the most dubious and careful consideration for every one of the "many infallible proofs" of its truth and reality on the part of every inquirer. St. Paul, himself, urges us to let no man fool us, but "to prove all things, hold fast that which is good." "Search the Scriptures" said our Lord to the Pharisees. "Come now, let us reason together" is the gracious invitation of the "High and Holy One who dwelleth in the high and holy place"; and those who "have laid hold on God's covenant" and taken the trouble to weigh the superabundant proofs God has provided for the assurance of all who will examine the credentials of the Gospel, are almost as grateful for the mental rest which such study produces as for the spiritual peace resulting from assurance of forgiven sins, eternal life, an assured bodily resurrection, reunion with radiant, restored, lost-awhile loved ones and "an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away reserved in heaven" for those "who are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation."

I have mentioned so far only the research made by lawyers into this most important of all questions confronting a human being; but personal experiences with business acquaintances who were not lawyers further illustrate the overwhelming effect on serious minds of the proofs on which Christian faith rests:

One of Washington's prominent real estate brokers is a schoolmate of mine. We parted when we finished the graded schools, and I did not see him again until I came back from college, my brain tingling with the great discovery that the religion of Christ was not a dubious thing to be regarded as a hopeful possibility, but a great reality which, while calling for the exercise of faith, was willing and eager to have its credentials most meticulously examined before it asked that con-

fidence be reposed in it. In our talk I soon got my chance to find out what his religious convictions were. Said he:

"Irwin, I have looked into all that, and there is nothing in it."

"Charlie, what have you read along this line?"

"Paine's 'Age of Reason,'" he replied, then he paused.

"What else?" I asked. "Go on."

"That's all."

"Haven't you read any on the other side?"

"I don't think there is more than about one side to it," was his answer.

"Will you read even one book on the side of the Bible?" I asked him.

"Certainly," he answered, "if there are any books an intelligent man can find worth reading."

Because it is so readable and, by using the author's experience in dealing with unbelievers so freely with his argument, stirs the interest and emotions more than pure close-knit reasoning, I gave him a copy of an old book I have already mentioned, Nelson's "Cause and Cure of Infidelity"—about which I shall have more to say later.

Several weeks passed. Then he came to my office to return the book, and said: "Irwin, I didn't know such things existed." He said more in explanation and amplification of his astonishment at the proofs that supported the Christian's faith in the Bible and Christ, but these are the only words I remember literally. He had not a word to say in opposition to Dr. Nelson's arguments or in support of his own unbelief.

As I write, it was some fifteen years ago, that Dr. R. C. Grier, then and now president of Erskine (my old "Scotch Covenanter Presbyterian") College in South Carolina, happened to be in my office when the telephone rang. I found I was connected with Baltimore, and at the other end of the line was a gentleman who was one of the officers of the Baltimore Association of Commerce, a highly educated German professional man to whom I had lent my old copy of Paley's "Evidences" about two weeks before. He had come into my office about a business matter, and before he left, rather unexpectedly, I fancy, found himself replying, to some leading questions, that his early faith

in Christ and the Bible was so in eclipse that there was hardly a vestige left.

He accepted with a smile my statement that, so far as his brain and intellectual belief were concerned, I would undertake to guarantee that he could not retain his unbelief if he would study the matter a bit, and start in with a book or two I offered then and there to lend him. Paley was handy in my bookcase, and he took it with him, after he had told me that he really had not known there were any noteworthy books in opposition to the agnostic and infidel writers.

Before this point was reached I had said to him:

"Mr. Von B—, for twenty years I have looked for the unbeliever in these things who at the same time was thoroughly familiar with the proofs in support of them. I haven't found him yet. You may be the exception, and if so you will spoil a generalization in which I have often indulged. Have you studied carefully any of the great works on the Christian Evidences?"

"No, I have not," he answered, "though I have read many of the opposite sort."

"That exception is still to find, then," I remarked, as I asked that he would report to me after he had finished Paley.

This long distance telephone call was the report. My friend said: "I certainly thank you for lending me that book. I am ninety-nine and nine-tenths converted, and I have still one chapter to read before I finish." (I have his letter to the same effect.)

This message, coming at the moment when I was telling the president of my old college of my experiences with unbelievers and the really amusing uniformity and completeness with which an agnostic's self-satisfied unbelief collapsed before the assault of almost any one of the old Christian apologists, was a most timely confirmation of my statement, and a most heart-warming encouragement to "carry on" in this line so long as life is in me.

I cannot resist mentioning a third somewhat similar experience when a client, educated in the German universities, spoke with contempt of the claims of Christianity. I defied him to despise them after he had read even one book I might pick out

for him. It so happened that it was another copy of the same old Paley. My client came into my office a few days later and said: "That man nearly drove me crazy. I lay awake all last night."

He was a clear thinker and loved to think, and he could not find any flaw or weakness in the argument. He went away, and I have not seen or heard of him for many years. Whether he has been converted I do not know. But I do know that he was a meek and silenced agnostic after he had received the mental broadside of that old "ship of the line" Paley, in defense of the faith once delivered and ever since committed to the saints as a sacred treasure and thrilling issue to maintain against all comers and at all hazards until the Prince come back again.

It takes proof of some cogency to silence an agnostic full of Huxley, and Hume's "Essay on Miracles," and with a superiority complex toward believing men and women. So many questions in life are left in doubt even after they are carefully pondered; but the blessed thing about this, the most important of all questions, is that when you are through, or really when you just make a fair beginning, there is no room for doubt left. The thing is simply demonstrated, that is all. A man who studies and uses the multiplication table knows it is true; and a man who studies and uses the Bible knows it is true. It can be proved theoretically, and it proves itself empirically.

You, my reader, may be the exception I did not find in any of the three men mentioned—but I doubt it. If you have never read Paley, or Alexander, or Mark Hopkins' "Evidences," for example, or if you read them long ago and have forgotten, read them again. If you have never, or for many years have not, read Paley's "Natural Theology," a work whose reasoning is as sound and unanswerable now as it ever was, read it; and if you have been hearing or reading the proponents of evolution, see if his argument from design does not sound like "words of truth and soberness" after the maunderings of a madhouse.

And I make no apology for referring back to these old books, any more than the English professor does for studying Shakespeare and Homer. While there has been a great accumulation of information, the vigor and power of the human mind and its ability to draw sound conclusions have not increased as sin- and

disease-stricken generations have interposed one step after another between them and the mighty intellect with which Jehovah endowed his first man, "Adam, which was the son of God." The son who inherits and adds to his father's fortune is not therefore a greater financier than the father who accumulated it; and the present-day scientists and "men of modern mind" who are the "heirs of all the ages" of accumulated knowledge are not necessarily stronger of mind and power to reason than those nearer the source of originally perfect mentality. Surely archeology does much to support the great English preacher who declared "Aristotle but the ruins of an Adam, and Athens but the relic of Eden." Do not let anyone dissuade you from reading Paley by saying his works are out of date. Sound reasoning is never out of date; and there were ample data in Paley's time to support his contention ten times over. There are many fine recent works on the evidences, but often an old book is like an old matured bond, and studying it is a safer investment. But, by all means, let everyone study this subject for himself, and be "ready always to give . . . a reason of the hope" that is in him—not only reasons from his own personal experience and altogether valid for him, but such as can penetrate the armor of any unbeliever. If you already believe, considering the unanswerable reasons for your faith will make it more vivid; if you are not now a believer, you will be before you are through.

II

OPENING THE CASE

PROPHECY

BUT in this day of fast motion and hurried thinking, there is a widespread belief that religion is something which from its nature no one can know enough about to make worth while the effort to arrive at a well-founded conclusion in regard to it; and the President of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism has put a popular argument against Christianity succinctly when he writes: "There are twenty-seven Bibles in the world; the Christian rejects twenty-six of them. The atheist rejects only one more than the Christian does," the persuasive inference being that since the Christian agrees with the atheist that twenty-six of these Bibles are false, the only reasonable thing to do is to reject the twenty-seventh also. A popular "conclusion of the whole matter" is that "it makes no difference what you believe, just so you are sincere": that a man's sincerity in following whatever faith he is inclined or was born to in the midst of bewildering and equally unverifiable claims of divine origin for rival religious books and leaders is assuredly all that a reasonable God can require.

Every trace of plausibility for this contention evaporates, however, in the burning light of the fact that uncertainty as to which is God's Book and who is God's Son is possible only to one who carelessly neglects to examine (largely as a result of criminal neglect on the part of Christians to advertise) the proofs God's forethought has provided for the conviction of any man who will take half as much care in investigating the religion he lives and dies by as he does the title to a house he plans to purchase and live in. And he who relies on this theory of the all-suffi-

ciency of sincerity has to admit that, if this rule operates in spiritual matters of eternal importance, it certainly does not here and in this life, where it can be tested in advance, and where sincerity in mistaking, for instance, mercuric for mercurous chloride (corrosive sublimate for calomel) has never been known to prevent or mitigate the deadly effects of the error.

The Bible tells us that there is one, and only one way to escape eternal death and secure eternal life: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved" (Rom. 10: 9). The way of salvation is many times declared, but always to the same effect. If the Bible is God's inspired, infallible Word, all who trust any other way of escape from God's eternal prison house are doomed. So the most important question in the world for every man of us to settle as quickly as possible is: Is this "twenty-seventh Bible," the "Holy Bible," God's one revelation of Himself and His covenant to men? But since men are confronted, as Mr. Smith tells us, with twenty-seven Bibles all making the same claim, what reason is there to justify a lawyer or any other intelligent man in rejecting utterly twenty-six Bibles and accepting the twenty-seventh? This is a fair question and calls for a satisfactory answer.

And now, first, to "clear the decks" of the twenty-six false Bibles, whose claims to divine inspiration are presented by the infidel as reducing to absurdity a claim for inspiration for any Bible, let us invoke the rule of law and logic that puts the burden of proof upon any plaintiff or proponent of establishing his contention by sufficient evidence; and when we do so, we find at once that not one of the twenty-six alleged Bibles presents even a "scintilla of proof" such as a law-trained man would consider in support of any claim of divine origin.

Has any one of us ever heard of a reason which would convince any rationally skeptical man that the Koran or the Book of Mormon, for instance, or the book written by Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, are to be regarded as anything more than normal or subnormal productions? Could not everything to be found in any of these books be readily duplicated and bettered? Is there known a single indubitably supernatural thing about them?

Mohammed declared that he was God's inspired prophet in giving the world the Koran. If a man believed him, often with a sword at his throat to convince him, he became a Moham-medan. A shred of proof was never offered. If anyone found himself able to "swallow" the story Joseph Smith told of his finding the golden plates from which he wrote his Bible, he became a Mormon. Smith never proved his assertion. A man or woman who is not firmly "rooted and grounded" in "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints" and who has never found the all-sufficient peace and power to meet life's sorrows and vicissitudes inherent in the "apostles' doctrine," in which is every good thing to be found in Christian Science with no admixture of its pagan pantheism, may become, as a matter of pure credulity and bewilderment, a "Christian Scientist."

Not so with the Christian. He is offered "many infallible proofs"—proofs such as would stand in a court of law. And to prove the truth of the gospel facts and the unmistakable supernaturalness of the Bible is the very thing that any Christian instructed in the "Evidences" longs for a chance to do for any unbelieving friend who will attend to this matter. And good it is to reflect that the one religion that has any proofs at all has all conceivable proofs, and that it is the religion which offers and promises the most which is the one and only religion which, while received by faith, is proved by evidence and logic which have led such great lawyers as those mentioned to declare it conclusive.

Everlasting life in an environment beautiful beyond conception, "Joys inexpressible in degree and eternal in duration," to be had as a free gift accompanied by the unswerving and unfathomable love of the eternal Son of God who, disguised as a Man, submitted Himself to the torturous death of a condemned felon to procure this eternal life for us—such is what Christianity offers us.

Supernatural and stupendous events, established by historical evidence which Greenleaf, in common with every other lawyer who has carefully studied the record, declares impregnable, and a standing miracle increasing in marvelousness as we now look upon it—such are samples of the proofs attesting the solid

reality of the offer and the accompanying warning of unendurable but eternal woe if it is not availed of in time.

Now to deal first with the latter of the two samples of Christian proofs above mentioned:

Keeping in mind the fact that neither the Koran nor any other false Bible, as far as I know, has ever attempted to foretell the future at all and that even the Pope of Rome, though claiming divine inspiration when speaking on matters of faith and doctrine, has never ventured on such an unmistakable test or proof of supernatural knowledge, when we open the Holy Bible we find on almost every page future events in multiplied and varied detail foretold as if as good as already done. And then when we read history, we find accomplished and being accomplished before our eyes the very things centuries ago foretold.¹ As surely as only God knows in advance what numerous free agents will do in a world where uncontrollable natural forces and unpredictable combinations of events make the happenings of the next moment uncertain, the men who wrote the Old Testament over two thousand years ago (to claim for it only the antiquity of the Septuagint Version which was translated from the Hebrew into the Greek in 285 B. C., by order of Ptolemy Philadelphus) wrote "as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" in foretelling with absolute precision the things which have subsequently come to pass, and many of which are happening before our eyes.

Can any man rationally ignore such a phenomenon as is presented by the correspondence between historical facts and the words of the prophet Ezekiel foretelling that, while Sidon's streets should run with blood (Ezek. 28: 22, 23), though the city should not be ended, Tyre should have the very dust scraped from off her (Ezek. 26: 4, 5)—as Alexander the Great literally did to the city; that she should be merely a top of a bare rock in the midst of the sea, and a place for the spreading of nets and nevermore be rebuilt (Ezek. 26: 14), exactly according to her fate and her present condition as illustrated in a photograph published in a recent number of the *National Geographic Magazine*.

¹ See Alexander Keith, "Demonstration of the Truth of the Christian Religion," Harper Bros., 1844, for more detailed consideration.

Can anyone intelligently disregard the words of Daniel—centuries before Christ—that Babylon, Persia, and Greece should be followed by a kingdom as much stronger than the others as iron is than gold, silver, or brass, which should obliterate the lines of previous kingdoms, divide into two parts (in fulfillment, the eastern and western empires of Rome), and finally into ten toes or kingdoms of Europe, whose governments are characterized today as foretold, on the one hand by the incohesiveness of clayey democracies and Communism, and on the other by the iron rule of the Fascism which originated with Mussolini in the capital of the ancient iron Roman Empire. And, to leave out of account all reference to the scores of other millennia-old prophecies giving names, exact dates and places and compound events, can any man read without amazement and awe the newspaper accounts of what is happening to the Jews in Germany, Poland, Roumania, Austria, and practically all over the world at this time and then consider the words of Moses to be found in this at least two-thousand-year-old Book in telling the Jews he was then leading into Palestine what would happen to them as a result of their forsaking the law and worship of their God:

"The Lord shall bring thee, and thy king which thou shalt set over thee, unto a nation which neither thou nor thy fathers have known; and there shalt thou serve other gods, wood and stone. And thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb, and a byword, among all nations whither the Lord shall lead thee. . . . And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone. And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest; but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind: And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear day and night, and shalt have none assurance of thy life: In the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even! And at even thou shalt say, Would God it were morning! for the fear of thine heart wherewith thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see" (Deut. 28: 36, 37, 64-67).

Other fulfilled and improbable prophecies predicted that while the nations then surrounding the Jews would be completely ended, though subject to no such scattering and banish-

ment of their people as foretold for the Jews, the Jews alone should not be ended and should not lose their racial identity (though it is obvious their persecution has, through the ages, presented every inducement to them to intermarry and escape their troubles by merging with other nationalities) and should, when came the time of the "twilight of the Gentiles," return to their long-deserted and desolate land, as they are doing at the present day.

The fact that the prophecies about the Jews—as about the coming Messiah—should be not only numerous and specific (in contrast with the Delphic and other Pagan oracles who felt and found it necessary to hedge against mistake in making even one single prediction by giving their words a "double aspect" to cover either contingency)—that these Bible prophecies are not only so numerous as to make accidental fulfillment almost infinitely improbable, but were of such nature that the events predicted seemed beforehand mutually destructive and were and are unparalleled in human history, multiplies the marvel of exact fulfillment by an element itself almost infinite in its effect on the miracle.

Should such a striking phenomenon be ignored in our thinking about these matters as is presented by the fact that the Jewish Passover has been celebrated continuously to this very year during these three or four thousand years (although the sacred fires of Persia and those tended by the Vestal Virgins of Rome which were to be kept burning forever have been out for centuries), in the light of the words we find in this same old Book:

"And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations: ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever" (Ex. 12: 14).

In this matter of prophecy two facts are self-evident: If the prophecy was not assuredly delivered long before the event, we have nothing to be astonished at; if the events did not and do not fulfill the prophecy, we have a demonstration that it was fraudulent. But here the predictions are found in a Book completed and translated into the world-famous Septuagint Version over two thousand years ago, the events fulfilling them are matters of personal knowledge and newspaper notoriety, and the

chance of accidental fulfillment of the prophecies in the Bible which have been actually and exactly done and accomplished has been compared by a great mathematician (Olinthus Gregory) to a fraction whose numerator is a grain of sand and whose denominator is the bulk of the earth many times magnified. Does any lawyer of us know of any other issue or item of human certainty established by such an overwhelming "weight of evidence" as this prophetic fulfillment which proves that the God who alone controls and knows the future put this supernatural thing in the Bible? Will any man deny his own eyesight that it is there? Will he deny his own reason that it is a miracle? And if a miracle, who but God could perform the thing which our very senses attest has been done?

We have an answer, therefore, to the infidel's argument, know that any number of imitations can never disprove the existence of the genuine and have a reason to concentrate our investigation on the claims of the one Book in all the world which presents to us the unmistakable and only possible miraculous feature a book can possess: genuine prophecy.

Before leaving this subject of prophecy, however, which St. Peter declared was so sure a proof of the joyful and supernatural things he declared (and what more joyful thing can be heard and known than that the "supernatural" is real and actual? with its angels, its heaven of beauty and delight, its radiant life beyond the grave, its miraculous answers to prayer?)—brief attention should be paid in passing to the present day widely advertised "prophecies" of Nostradamus, Mother Ship-ton, Thomas Jefferson, George Washington and so many others that it would seem that predicting future events is within the powers of almost anyone with a high school education.

Now that only the One—if there be such an One—who controls the future can make it certain and thereby know it and make it known would seem to be a truism, not of faith or theology, but of simple arithmetic and common sense. And I, for one, am willing to concede the supernatural in any case where the three elements of real prophecy are united: delivery unquestionably long before the event, exact fulfillment ("divine prophecy admits of no failure or approximate fulfillment") and sufficient details to eliminate the chance of mere coinci-

dence. These criteria are not to be found anywhere but in the Bible, as far as my research goes. If they were I would believe there had been a "leak" in the heavenly counsels or that God had given prophetic knowledge outside of inspiration.

Satan's concern lest the culminating fulfillment of the Bible's prophecies at this time startle mankind into repentance and regard for the Bible is manifestly at the bottom of the widespread advertisements (the last of which I received today) in which at least twenty-two prophets, from Mother Shipton and Nostradamus to Generals Grant and McClellan are presented as revealing the future. The argument for anyone to draw is too obvious to escape notice: If anyone from Mother Shipton and Madam Blavatsky to Joseph Smith and Thomas Jefferson can foretell the future, manifestly St. Peter was foolish in speaking of the "sure word of prophecy" and a Christian is in laying any stress upon it. That which can be done by almost everyone affords no evidence that the hand of the Lord was involved in its doing by anyone.

But it takes no prophetic revelation for a man versed in history to predict, as the men mentioned did, that like causes will in the future produce generally similar effects to those of the past. Anyone whose views of political economy are based on the fundamental principles Adam Smith made clear in his "Wealth of Nations" can easily foretell the ultimate result of the violation of these basic laws in scattering into fragments for consumption (by the nine spenders to one saver of which statistics show mankind consists) of the accumulations of savings in the form of capital which alone make possible the sheltering and tooling needed for the production by the workman of that excess of production over consumption which is the only source of wealth and even of taxes. Such shrewd predictions as Jefferson and Washington made and notably the one by Macaulay as to the final effect of giving equal voice in directing the government to the many who had all to gain and nothing to lose with the few who had a "stake" in the country, something to lose through unwise legislation as well as something to gain by well considered laws, can be presented as matching Bible prophecy only by those "for whom it maketh" in Bacon's phrase "that

there be no God " as the source of the Bible's solemn and dread predictions.

As for Mother Shipton, it seems to have been forgotten that her supposed prophecy of 1448 was edited and amended even after its concoction by Charles Hindley in 1862; and the scattering predictions of Nostradamus, as I am only slightly familiar with them, remind me of the time I failed to hit a difficult target with a rifle and brought it down quickly with my shotgun. The utter folly of one of his definite predictions is before us in the failure of the world to end on the first day that Easter came at its latest possible date—which happened in 1886 as well as this year.

A certain famous Latin writer once hazarded the prediction that some day a land would be discovered to the west of the Atlantic Ocean, and this happy guess that there would be a repetition of discoveries often made in the past has been cited by deists as a triumphant match to the prophecies of Scripture. If Seneca had prophesied that a continent greater than Europe would be discovered by a man named Christopher Columbus in the exact year 1492 (more than matched by Isaiah's¹ naming the very Persian king who should restore Jerusalem centuries before his birth, the foretelling of the exact length of the Babylonian captivity, and by Daniel centuries in advance² of the exact day when Messiah the Prince should be revealed³) every Christian as well as Pagan would have strong reason to believe that we had here an "act of God." But we find nothing even approaching such exacting precision outside the Bible.

The ambiguity of the predictions of the Delphic and other ancient oracles are matters of common knowledge. "*Ille die hostem Romanorum peritum esse*" (on that day the enemy of Rome will perish) pronounced the Delphic Oracle to Maxentius about to fight Constantine, to his great encouragement until the fact of his own perishing made clear that the oracle had not committed itself after all. "*Kroisos Halun diabas, megalan arkan katelusei*" (if Croesus cross the Halys he will destroy a mighty empire) declared the same Oracle to Croesus when he

¹ Isaiah 44: 28.

² Daniel 9: 25.

³ Appendix A.

sought to know in advance the result of his contemplated campaign against Persia. But a certain incident connected with this matter as related by Herodotus is worthy of comment,¹ as it illustrates the limitations of the supernormal power this Oracle, (along with many other people to this day) possessed; and that is the power of mental telepathy and of the daemons of Christ's day, the disembodied spirits with which Scripture forbids us to have dealings, and psychical research indicates are a dangerous reality, to make known things done at a distance and not observable by the five senses.

Herodotus tells us that Croesus, with a healthy skepticism about the supernatural powers of the Delphic and other oracles, devised a test which he thought would be conclusive if met. He instructed his servants on the hundredth day after their departure to ask the oracle what he, Croesus, was doing, on which day he cut up and seethed in a brazen pot a sheep and a tortoise. The Pythoness at Delphi responded to his inquiry with the following verse:

"I count the sands and know the measures of ocean;
I understand the dumb and hear him that speaketh not.
On my sense there stole the savor of a strong shelled tortoise
Boiling in a caldron with the flesh of a lamb.
Brass is the couch beneath it and brass the robe upon it."

On reading this Croesus "performed an act of adoration." The Oracle had met his test and he gave complete confidence therefore to its prediction which he interpreted to mean that he would destroy Persia—instead, as the event turned out, of Persia destroying his own mighty empire. The unseen beings with whom the Delphic Oracle had contact could tell what was being done at a distance but they could not tell what the future would bring forth, and so had recourse to the usual oracular ambiguity.

We may know assuredly then that real prophecy is an act of God which no man or devil can duplicate and that the one book which has this miraculous thing woven through it like a water mark has no rival.

¹ See Pember's "Earth's Earliest Ages," p. 285.

III

THE FACTUAL FOUNDATION

EVEN as the Bible has no rival in being the only book containing supernaturally given and fulfilled prophecy, so the Christian religion is the only religion based upon and inseparably connected with historical facts—facts of such nature that if established, so also is established the religion based upon them.

In dealing with this phase of the proofs of Christianity, no better or greater authority can be called upon than the Simon Greenleaf from whom we have already briefly quoted. Of him the *London Law Journal* wrote in 1874:

"It is no mean honor to America that her schools of jurisprudence have produced two of the first writers and best esteemed legal authorities of this century—the great and good man, Judge Story, and his eminent and worthy associate, Professor Greenleaf. Upon the existing law of evidence (by Greenleaf) more light has shone from the New World than from all the lawyers who adorn the courts of Europe."

And Chief Justice Fuller, of the United States Supreme Court, once asserted of Greenleaf that "he is the highest authority cited in our courts."

In giving his "Testimony of the Evangelists" to the bar, Greenleaf writes:

"To the members of the legal profession:

"Gentlemen:

"The subject of the following work I hope will not be deemed so foreign to our professional pursuits as to render it improper for me to dedicate it, as I now respectfully do, to you.

"If a close examination of the evidence of Christianity may be expected of one class of men more than another, it would seem incumbent upon us who make the law of evidence one of our peculiar studies.

Our profession leads us to explore the mazes of falsehood, to detect its artifices, to pierce its thickest veils, to follow and expose its sophistries, to compare the statements of different witnesses with severity, to discover truth and separate it from error.

"Our fellow men are well aware of this, and probably they act upon this knowledge more generally and with more profound repose than we are in the habit of considering. The influence too of the legal profession upon the community is unquestionably great, conversant as it daily is with all classes and grades of men in their domestic and social relations and in all the affairs of life from the cradle to the grave. This influence we are constantly exerting for good or ill; and hence to refuse to acquaint ourselves with the evidences of the Christian religion, or to act as though, having fully examined, we lightly esteem them is to assume an appalling amount of responsibility.

"The things related by the evangelists are certainly of the most momentous character, affecting the principles of our conduct here and our happiness forever.

"The religion of Jesus Christ aims at nothing less than the utter overthrow of all other systems of religion of the world; denouncing them as inadequate to the wants of man, false in their foundations and dangerous in their tendency. It not only solicits the grave attention of all, to whom its doctrines are presented, but it demands their cordial belief as a matter of vital concernment. These are no ordinary claims; and it seems hardly possible for a rational being to regard them with even a subdued interest; much less to treat them with mere indifference and contempt. If not true, they are little else than the pretensions of a bold imposture which, not satisfied with having already enslaved millions of the human race, seeks to continue its encroachments upon human liberty until all nations shall be subjugated under its iron rule. But if they are well founded and just they can be no less than the high requirements of Heaven, addressed by the voice of God to the reason and understanding of man, concerning things deeply affecting his relations to his sovereign and essential to the formation of his character and of course to his destiny, both for this life and for the life to come. Such was the estimate taken of religion, even the religion of pagan Rome, by one of the greatest lawyers of antiquity, when he argued that it was either nothing at all, or was everything. *Aut undique religionem tolle, aut usquequaque conserva* (Cicero, Phillip. II, par. 43).

"With this view of the importance of the subject, and in the hope that the present work may in some degree aid or at least incite others to a more successful pursuit of this interesting study, it is submitted to your kind regard by

"Your obedient servant,

"SIMON GREENLEAF"

At one place in the great book thus dedicated Greenleaf remarks:

"The essential marks of difference between true narratives of fact and works of fiction are unmistakable,"

and to quote further,

"the attributes of truth are strikingly apparent throughout the Gospel histories, and the absence of all others is equally remarkable."

Here is an illustration of one of these differences which Greenleaf does not even mention.

While romances, legends and false testimony are careful to place the events related in some distant place and some indefinite time, thereby violating the first rules we lawyers learn of good pleading, that "the declaration must give time and place," the Bible narratives give us the date and place of the things related with the utmost precision, as for instance when Luke tells us when Christ's ministry, immediately preceded by John's proclamation, began:

"Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Ituraea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene,

"Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests" (Luke 3: 1-2)

then came the beginning of Christ's ministry and the doing of the "mighty works" which so convinced the apostolic observers and recorders of them of His deity that they devoted the rest of their lives to spreading the news of them and making known to all the men they could reach, Jew and Gentile, that there was pardon for sin and everlasting life to be had by believing and relying upon the atoning death and bodily resurrection of the Jewish Messiah who had turned out to be the light and salvation of the Gentiles also.

How significant of a consciousness of utter truth and certainty this prodigality of detail in lining up seven public officials as holding office contemporaneously in a definite year of Tiberius' reign!

The Apostle John in concluding his testimony or record of the things he said he saw Christ do and heard Him say, explains the purpose of his writing his account:

"And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name" (John 20: 30-31).

But the first step in arriving at certainty that Jesus Christ lived and died and rose from the dead and performed the miracles attributed to Him is to make sure of the authenticity of the records of these things.

This we can do with the utmost certainty by applying fundamental laws of thought to unquestionable facts. A fact known to all who have given any study at all to this subject is that these books were quoted, listed, catalogued, harmonized, cited as authority by different writers, Christian and Pagan, right back to the time of the apostles. Celsus, for instance, a bitter opponent of Christianity who was born only fifty years after the life of St. John, mentioned the four Gospels as being in his day the sacred books of the Christians. The Gospels, then, were written before the time of Celsus and Justin Martyr and Polycarp, the disciple of John, Irenaeus and the others who quoted them, as surely as a book has to be written by someone before it can be quoted by anyone.

On this important but obvious point let Greenleaf speak again:

"If any ancient document concerning our public rights had been lost, copies which had been as universally received and acted upon as the four gospels have been would have been received in evidence in any of our courts, without the slightest hesitation. The entire text of the *Corpus Juris Civilis* is received as authority in all the courts of Continental Europe upon much weaker evidence of genuineness."

Unless one, therefore, desires to apply to the Gospels the theory Mark Twain satirized with the remark that Shakespeare's plays were not written by him but by another man of the same name, and to believe that the Gospels were not written by the apostles to whom they have been universally attributed from

the earliest times, but by some other remarkable men of the same names, there is no room for question that the records of the words and acts of Jesus of Galilee came from the pens of the men who, with John, wrote what they had "heard" and "seen" and their hands had "handled of the Word of life."

Among the things they reported were Christ's cure of cripples, blind men, lepers (one having "confluent leprosy" as Dr. Luke reports) under conditions of roadside publicity that made imposture and mistake impossible; that He stopped a storm with a word; that three dead people (one in the tomb four days) returned to life at His command and that He, Himself, in exact accordance with His prediction, returned to them from the grave three days after being publicly executed, and that He consorted with them after His resurrection for a period of about a month and ten days. If He truly did these things I believe no man will or could question His divine nature and authority. It remains, therefore, only to ascertain whether the laws of thought and rules of evidence can enable us to know for a certainty that He did do the supernatural things reported in these documents, or Gospels, that were written by some persons at or shortly after the time they were done and, from conclusive internal evidence, by men who were, at least as to three of them, eyewitnesses as they allege. On this point let us hear again from Greenleaf:

"The great truths which the apostles declared were that Christ had risen from the dead, and that only through repentance from sin, and faith in him, could men hope for salvation. This doctrine they asserted with one voice, everywhere, not only under the greatest discouragements, but in the face of the most appalling terrors that can be presented to the mind of man. Their master had recently perished as a malefactor, by the sentence of a public tribunal. His religion sought to overthrow the religions of the whole world. The laws of every country were against the teachings of his disciples. The interests and passions of all the rulers and great men in the world were against them. The fashion of the world was against them. Propagating this new faith, even in the most inoffensive and peaceful manner, they could expect nothing but contempt, opposition, revilings, bitter persecutions, stripes, imprisonments, torments and cruel deaths. Yet this faith they zealously did propagate; and all these miseries they endured undismayed, nay, rejoicing. As one after another was put to a miserable death, the survivors only prosecuted their work with increased vigor and resolution. The annals of military warfare afford scarcely an example of the like

heroic constancy, patience and unblenching courage. They had every possible motive to review carefully the grounds of their faith, and the evidences of the great facts and truths which they asserted; and these motives were pressed upon their attention with the most melancholy and terrific frequency. It was therefore impossible that they could have persisted in affirming the truths they have narrated had not Jesus actually risen from the dead, and had they not known this fact as certainly as they knew any other fact. If it were morally possible for them to have been deceived in this matter, every human motive operated to lead them to discover and avow their error. To have persisted in so gross a falsehood, after it was known to them, was not only to encounter, for life, all the evils which man could inflict, from without, but to endure also the pangs of inward and conscious guilt; with no hope of future peace, no testimony of a good conscience, no expectation of honor or esteem among men, no hope of happiness in this life, or in the world to come.

"Such conduct in the apostles would moreover have been utterly irreconcilable with the fact that they possessed the ordinary constitution of our common nature. Yet their lives do show them to have been men like all others of our race; swayed by the same motives, animated by the same hopes, affected by the same joys, subdued by the same sorrows, agitated by the same fears, and subject to the same passions, temptations and infirmities, as ourselves. And their writings show them to have been men of vigorous understandings. If then their testimony was not true, there was no possible motive for this fabrication.

"It would also have been irreconcilable with the fact that they were good men. But it is impossible to read their writings, and not feel that we are conversing with men eminently holy, and of tender consciences, with men acting under an abiding sense of the presence and omniscience of God, and of their accountability to him, living in his fear, and walking in his ways. Now, though, in a single instance, a good man may fall, when under strong temptations, yet he is not found persisting, for years, in deliberate falsehood, asserted with the most solemn appeals to God, without the slightest temptation or motive, and against all the opposing interests which reign in the human breast. If, on the contrary, they are supposed to have been bad men, it is incredible that such men should have chosen this form of imposture; enjoining, as it does, unfeigned repentance, the utter forsaking and abhorrence of all falsehood and of every other sin, the practice of daily self-denial, self-abasement and self-sacrifice, the crucifixion of the flesh with all its earthly appetites and desires, indifference to the honors, and hearty contempt of the vanities of the world; and inculcating perfect purity of heart and life, and intercourse of the soul with heaven. It is incredible that bad men should invent falsehoods to promote the religion of the God of truth. The supposition is suicidal. If they did believe in a future state of retribution, a heaven and a hell hereafter, they took the most certain course, if false witnesses, to secure the latter for their por-

tion. And if, still being bad men, they did not believe in future punishment, how came they to invent falsehoods the direct and certain tendency of which was to destroy all their prospects of worldly honor and happiness, and to insure their misery in this life? From these absurdities there is no escape but in the conviction and admission that they were good men, testifying to that which they had carefully observed and considered and well knew to be true."

And again:

"The attributes of truth are strikingly apparent throughout the Gospel histories and the absence of all others is equally remarkable.

"The writers allude, for example, to the existing manners and customs and to the circumstances of the times and of their country, with the utmost minuteness of reference. And these references are never formally made, nor with preface and explanation, never multiplied and heaped on each other, nor brought together, as though introduced by design; but they are scattered broadcast and singly over every part of the story, and so connect themselves with every incident related, as to render the detection of falsehood inevitable. This minuteness, too, is not peculiar to any one of the historians, but is common to them all. Though they wrote at different periods and without mutual concert, they all alike refer incidentally to the same state of affairs, and to the same contemporary and collateral circumstances. Their testimony, in this view, stands on the same ground with that of four witnesses, separately examined before different commissioners, upon the same interrogatories, and all adverting incidentally to the same circumstances as surrounding and accompanying the principal transaction, to which alone their attention is directed. And it is worthy of observation that these circumstances were at that time of a peculiar character. Hardly a state or kingdom in the world ever experienced so many vicissitudes in its government and political relations as did Judea during the period of the gospel history. It was successively under the government of Herod the Great, of Archelaus, and of a Roman magistrate; it was a kingdom, a tetrarchate, and a province; and its affairs, its laws, and the administration of justice, were all involved in the confusion and uncertainty naturally to be expected from recent conquest. It would be difficult to select any place or period in the history of nations, for the time and scene of a fictitious history or an imposture, which would combine so many difficulties for the fabricator to surmount, so many contemporary writers to confront with him, and so many facilities for the detection of falsehood.¹

* * * * *

"There is also a striking naturalness in the characters exhibited in the

¹ See Chalmers' "Evidences," Chapter 3.

sacred historians, rarely if ever found in works of fiction, and probably nowhere else to be collected in a similar manner from fragmentary and incidental allusions and expressions, in the writings of different persons. Take, for example, that of Peter, as it may be gathered from the evangelists, and it will be hardly possible to conceive that four persons, writing at different times, could have concurred in the delineation of such a character, if it were not real; a character too, we must observe, which is nowhere expressly drawn, but is shown only here and there, casually, in the subordinate parts of the main narrative. Thus disclosed, it is that of a confident, sanguine, and zealous man; sudden and impulsive, yet humble and ready to retract; honest and direct in his purposes; ardently loving his master, yet deficient in fortitude and firmness in his cause. When Jesus put any question to the apostles, it was Peter who was foremost to reply; and if they would inquire of Jesus, it was Peter who was readiest to speak. He had the impetuous courage to cut off the ear of the High Priest's servant, who came to arrest his master; and the weakness to dissemble before the Jews, in the matter of eating with Gentile converts. It was he who ran with John to the sepulchre, on the first intelligence of the resurrection of Jesus, and with characteristic zeal rushed in, while John paused without the door. He had the ardor to desire and the faith to attempt to walk on the water, at the command of his Lord; but as soon as he saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid. He was the first to propose the election of another apostle in the place of Judas; and he it was who courageously defended them all, on the day of Pentecost, when the multitude charged them with being filled with new wine. He was forward to acknowledge Jesus to be the Messiah; yet having afterwards endangered his own life by wounding the servant of the High Priest, he suddenly consulted his own safety by denying the same Master, for whom, but a few hours before, he had declared himself ready to die. We may safely affirm that the annals of fiction afford no example of a similar but not uncommon character, thus incidentally delineated.

"There are other internal marks of truth in the narratives of the evangelists, which, however, need here be only alluded to, as they have been treated with great fullness and force by able writers, whose works are familiar to all. Among these may be mentioned the nakedness of the narratives; the absence of all parade by the writers about their own integrity, of all anxiety to be believed, or to impress others with a good opinion of themselves or their cause, of all marks of wonder, or of desire to excite astonishment at the greatness of the events they record, and of all appearance of design to exalt their Master. On the contrary, there is apparently the most perfect indifference on their part, whether they are believed or not; or rather, the evident consciousness that they are recording events well known to all, in their own country and times, and undoubtedly to be believed, like any other matter of public history, by readers in all other countries and ages. It is worthy, too, of especial observation, that though the evangelists record

the unparalleled sufferings and cruel death of their beloved Lord, and this, too, by hands and with the consenting voices of those on whom he had conferred the greatest benefits, and their own persecutions and dangers, yet they have bestowed no epithets of harshness or even of just censure on the authors of all this wickedness, but have everywhere left the plain and unincumbered narrative to speak for itself, and the reader to pronounce his own sentence of condemnation; like true witnesses, who have nothing to gain or to lose by the event of the cause, they state the facts, and leave them to their fate. Their simplicity and artlessness, also, should not pass unnoticed, in readily stating even those things most disparaging to themselves. Their want of faith in their master, their dullness of apprehension of his teachings, their strifes for pre-eminence, their inclination to call fire from heaven upon their enemies, their desertion of their Lord in his hour of extreme peril; these and many other incidents tending directly to their own dishonor are nevertheless set down with all the directness and sincerity of truth as by men writing under the deepest sense of responsibility to God. Some of the more prominent instances of this class of proofs will be noticed hereafter, in their proper places, in the narratives themselves.

"... The narratives of the evangelists are now submitted to the reader's perusal and examination, upon the principles and by the rules already stated. With the relative merits of modern harmonists, and with points of controversy among theologians, the writer has no concert. His business is that of a lawyer, examining the testimony of witnesses by the rules of his profession, in order to ascertain whether, if they had thus testified on oath, in a court of justice, they would be entitled to credit; and whether their narratives, as we now have them, would be received as ancient documents, coming from the proper custody. If so, then it is believed that every honest and impartial man will act consistently with that result by receiving their testimony in all the extent of its import."

And now note what disintegrating violence the rejecter of Christianity must do to his mind and every trusted rule and principle of reasoning to maintain his unbelief. He must either maintain that the signs and earmarks of truth and reality in the testimony of the evangelists which so impressed Greenleaf are not to be found in such testimony at all or are, Greenleaf to the contrary notwithstanding, inconclusive and without significance. That they exist everyone who can verify Greenleaf's references from his own Testament knows; that they are the indicia of historic truth and reality the world's greatest expert, the uniform experience of lawyers for centuries and every man's common sense agree in declaring. Which horn of the dilemma shall he take?

IV

FACING THE EVIDENCE

So invariable had been my observation that he who does not accept wholeheartedly the evangelical, conservative belief in Christ and the Scriptures has never read, has forgotten, or never been able to weigh—and certainly is utterly unable to refute—the irresistible force of the cumulative evidence upon which such faith rests, that there seems ample ground for the conclusion that such ignorance is an invariable element in such unbelief. And this is so even though the unbeliever be a preacher, who is supposed to know this subject if he know no other.

I asked the young assistant pastor of one of Washington's greatest churches, whose attitude was one of discriminating patronage toward the Scriptures, whether he had studied carefully at the seminary any one of several old works which pointed out things which should have made such a mental attitude impossible. He had never read any of them.

I cross-examined a liberal preacher—the eloquent pastor of a New York church, my guest during a Washington convention, who held that no intelligent man could accept the verbal, plenary inspiration of the Bible—how he accounted for certain things about the Bible which I could account for in no other way, only to learn that he had overlooked or neglected to include this data altogether in his induction; and a short perusal of certain portions of Gaussen's "Theopneustia," of which he, a preacher, had never even heard (!) seemed to cause him such mental discomfort that, without even attempting to answer Gaussen's argument, he laid the book impatiently aside.

If that preacher had been a lawyer, the very force with which the author combated the reader's views would have roused him to an effort to answer the argument or admit the conclusion. When a lawyer writes a brief or argues a case he must admit or disprove his adversary's contention, and the judge, learned in the law and logic and the ways of mankind, passes on his ef-

fort. Unlike the preacher and the doctor, who work without open opposition, every belief and contention a lawyer makes is effective only as its validity enables it to prevail over opposition. This, it seems to me, lends double weight to the fact commented on by Dr. Nelson and Charles G. Finney that of all men the lawyer is the most able to weigh and apt to admit the Bible's claims when these claims are seriously considered.

The inerrant inspiration or entire truth and accuracy of the Bible is an item of the orthodox Christian's faith whose importance lawyers should have little difficulty in conceding. The accuracy of the record of a case on appeal is a thing that must be settled beyond dispute before an appellate court will undertake to form an opinion about the trial below; and the infallibility of the record upon which rest the eternal essentials of our faith—the deity of Christ, His voluntary, atoning death, bodily resurrection and impending return in power and glory—are all rendered uncertain in a mind in which the accuracy of the Bible record is in doubt. If we do not give full faith and credit to the Written Word which we have seen, experience proves that we are in great danger sooner or later of diminishing the love and honor we give the living Word whom we have not seen; for our conviction that that marvelous thing, that God became flesh and dwelt among us, is true is based upon the facts on which such conclusion rests; and if the record of the facts be impugned, who can retain the conclusion based upon them?

When I have read, however, certain of the duller portions of the Old Testament and remembered some of the loose things I have heard laid down in Modernist pulpits as a basis for faith such as "I know the Bible is inspired because it inspires me," and reflected that many a time singing the "Star Spangled Banner" has stirred me much more deeply than long chapters in Chronicles, I have felt that some better basis for faith in inspiration than that was needed by me. When I have reflected that either God had no part or purpose in the writing of the Bible—impossible to believe because of its many supernatural features—or had written partially what He wanted or brought to pass the writing of exactly what He desired, it has seemed to me that only the last alternative was tenable. As to the less interesting parts of the Bible this thought has helped me: that

just as different instruments and parts of a perfect orchestra each supply its essential but of itself not superlative contribution to the perfect result, so the dull records and genealogies and historical accounts in the Bible, designed for information not inspiration, could be dull but perfectly contributing parts of a perfect whole. No one I suppose feels that the little oboe is a particularly beautiful musical instrument; it cannot compare with the violin or clarinet; but doubtless we all agree that many a symphony would lack perfect rendition without the contribution of its cicada-like reedy note; and the rugged foundation stones of the Parthenon are conceivably as ideal for their use and purpose as the slightly convex floor (to prevent the saucer-like effect of the wide expanse that Phidias had the skill to avoid) or the subtly bulging lines of the columns to produce the maximum of esthetic joy in all who through the ages have admired this masterpiece of architecture.¹

It seems to many that a surrender of the tenet of the infallibility of Scripture is an unimportant one which will only "straighten out the line," in military parlance, and make the remainder of the Christian territory easier to defend. The exact reverse of this is true in my experience and observation, and the surrender of this "salient" necessitates a withdrawal of the whole line to a position hardly worth defending. The deadly effect on my faith and the insuperable difficulties in which I found myself involved when I made a tentative trial of the views of such writers as Ladd and Marcus Dods—that the Bible may be wrong, and is only human in all but its religious teachings—made this matter clear to me for all time; and I have long felt that a preacher who surrenders to the enemy such a strong and thoroughly defensible position without a blow (for only thus can it be lost) is guilty of little less than spiritual treason.

The infallibility of a book thousands of years old seems such a preposterous postulate to unbelief that it really seems to invite attack; and only one familiar with the history of Zion's warfare knows what humiliation and disaster its apparent vulnerability has wrought among those who have assailed it, as archeology and attested science have exploded one after another of the hostile "assured results of higher criticism." How

¹ See Appendix "B." "Divine Human in the Scriptures."

strange, if false, that the claim that so old a book is the very word of the eternal God, and free from scientific or historical or any error in all its parts, should be even an open question in this day to anyone, and especially that it should be a closed question to the thousands of the world's greatest and most learned men who have studied and assented to it! For they have accepted it against the handicap of every natural man's disinclination to submit to its holy and rigorous requirements and restraints (false religions, on the contrary, being favored by the downward pull of the carnal liberty offered as a bonus to their acceptance). They have declared that its minutest historical statements are true, that its most detailed and impossible prophecies have been literally fulfilled, that it is accurate to the exact spelling of the polysyllabic names of a whole list of kings dead three thousand years, accurate in the number of legs (among those it possesses) used by an obscure insect in walking; and accurate in what it says in the field of such comparatively recent scientific discoveries as the shape and support of the earth, the operation of the trade winds, the use of lightning in the formation of rain, and the only part of the whole heavens just now found to be entirely empty of stars!

And how thrilling as we gaze at Alcyone, the bright star of the group Pleiades, to wonder if we see at a distance heaven, our Father's home city, since astronomy now tells us that this very star is indeed the "hinge" its ancient name indicates, about which revolves our whole galaxy, the Milky Way, and it is the constellation about which God asked Job if he could control the "sweet influence"—the beneficent power of some sort—that emanated from it. Possibly the ancient tradition that Alcyone is heaven is true and based on a conversation Adam and Eve may have had when they walked with God in the cool of the evening in Eden before sin came, and asked their Creator and loving Father which star was His heaven. And how significant may be the other question to Job, as a reminder how great was the power of the God he had presumed to murmur against, when Arcturus and his sons or satellites were indicated as needing the guidance this now known to be "run-away star" among stars specially needs!

Surely if this book were not God's own, the discoveries of the

passing ages would have made a contention of its inerrancy preposterous instead of supplying an ever increasing number of things to confirm the faith of such famous astronomers as Newton and Herschel and of Lord Kelvin of our own day, "the greatest physicist of the last two centuries," that only supernatural revelation could account for them.

And with such a book, not only does our faith in the joys, reality, and way it points out to another world rest on solid facts happening in this, but our faith in these past recorded facts is fortified by present, personal contact with the miracle of a superhuman book which we can see and handle and test with our own minds. For the Bible is a book whose supernatural qualities bring us into direct contact with a miracle almost as unmistakable as those narrated on its pages—past miracles established by proof which is itself a present miracle!

Among other things, a divinely accurate record in the Bible makes a certainty of that most momentous of all events, the bodily resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ; and this certainty qualifies Him as the one "duly qualified expert witness" to testify to what lies beyond the portals of death, in that "bourne from which" this divine "traveler" did "return." In every law court, before a man is allowed to testify as to a matter where expert opinion or special knowledge is required, he must be "duly qualified." If not qualified his testimony is inadmissible for any purpose. This rule of law and good sense would exclude the teachings and opinions of all other founders of religions and sects as to the other life. They don't know. They cannot be qualified as experts. The strictest cross-examination is allowed as to qualification; but a witness who can show as a matter of fact that he is qualified as an expert can testify, and no one but another expert can be heard to differ. The actuality of Christ's resurrection is a proper subject for the most dubious scrutiny; but, if once established, His testimony is to be taken without reserve. This is good law, logic, sense, and theology. And how happy a thing it is that His testimony is so unshakable and His qualification so indubitable! For it gives us information so cheering, reassuring and transporting that it turns the most stricken and burdened Christian life into a thing of romance and glory, soon to enter upon the enjoyment of an "in-

heritance" in that "sweet and blessed country the home of God's elect," where the humblest of the "shining ones" enjoys the delights of fellowship with eternal friends in mansions out-rivalling the white beauty of Greek temples half hidden in groves of evergreens—prepared for him by the God who lighted the stars in the sky and who "washed him from his sins in His own blood!"

And the actual, physical reality of this earthly fact of Christ's resurrection, on which rests our heavenly future, is not only so established that the greatest lawyers have declared it to be the best proved fact of all history, but it is so supported that it is difficult to conceive of any method or line of proof that it lacks which would make more certain any event that even God designed to place beyond the possibility of doubt for all succeeding generations. The truth of this will appear only on careful consideration of the question how God could give and authenticate a revelation better than He has.

Inscriptions recording past events in stone, though great as the pyramids, would be inconclusive. Neither an inscription nor a pyramid can be cross-examined by torture to test its truth; nor could such an inscription be guarded against alteration (as actually happened) as were the Gospels—the depositions of the Evangelists—by their immediate and widespread scattering abroad.

Letters of fire on the sky—the method Tom Paine, in the foolish wisdom of his day, suggested as a sure way that God should have used to authenticate His revelation—are now used for pyrotechnical display and airplane cigarette advertising. A voice from the sky might be that present-day commonplace, a "magnavox" in a flying machine.

Instead, the Gospel has as its factual foundation certain events that happened at the world's most cultured cynical and skeptical age. These events were as notorious as a public execution, and as unmistakable as the difference between the resurrected life or the continuing death and progressing putrefaction of the person executed.

The most unexpected and astounding fact of resurrection from the dead and open ascension into Heaven was testified to by people who said they were eyewitnesses. A strong

and subtle evidence of lack of human artifice is found in the fact that the Hero of this epic did not take the trouble to confound the Sanhedrin and the Roman governor, as any human authors would have arranged the story, but appeared only to His friends, whose faith was to be established for the sake of themselves and all succeeding generations.

The eyewitnesses, in giving this testimony, were either lying about a matter which they knew was false, for the sole reward of torture in this world and punishment in the next, or were sincerely deluded into thinking that a dead, putrefying corpse on their hands was a live man who talked and ate with them, or else they were telling the truth about an unmistakable fact that was so certainly manifested to them as to make the whole Roman Empire unable to shake their testimony or stem the tide of their evangelism.

We have at least three of these witnesses reducing their testimony to writing, so that the deadly test of truth, cross-examination, may be brought into play; and they record as the most natural and logical events the fulfillment, in twenty-four hours, of twenty-five or more impossibly unlikely prophecies about the Man who died on Calvary, these prophecies having been delivered centuries before and culminating in the crowning event of His bodily resurrection and activities as an unmistakably live Man.

We have the date of these depositions or Gospels as practically contemporaneous with the events recorded proved by the dialect (a sort of Greek Yiddish) in which they were written and their citation as ancient and sacred documents by authors and controversialists both Christian and Pagan (as Celsus, Porphyry, Hierocles, Julian) keenly watching them for inaccuracies, whose writings are in our hands, some of them dating back almost to the lifetime of the contemporaries of the apostles themselves.¹

We have in the change or abandonment of that most ancient of all memorial institutions, the Sabbath Day, and the adoption of another day instead of the one observed from the foundation of the world up to the time of the resurrection of Christ, com-

¹ See also Appendix "C."

pounded evidence of the happening of a real cause for so striking and permanent a result.

We have in these depositions (the Gospels) certain predictions attributed to Christ, whose utterance before the event can be established by hostile testimony, while the detailed fulfillment of the predictions is narrated by both a Jewish (Josephus) and a great infidel (Gibbon) historian, the latter quoting as his authority a Pagan writing contemporaneously with the events recorded.^{1 1a}

We have the recorded words of Jesus Christ, equally impossible to account for as spoken by or falsely attributed to a mortal man, which words as self-evidencing phenomena are before us in "proper person" without dependence upon credence in anything but our own eyes and minds: "I am the light of the world." "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." "I am the resurrection and the life. If a man believe in me though he were dead yet shall he live; and he that liveth and believeth in me shall never die." "Before Abraham was I am." "If these held their peace" (those hailing His entry into Jerusalem) "the very stones would cry out." "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee." "Lo I am with thee always, even unto the end of the world." "I will; be thou clean." "Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace." "Peace be still" to the storm. "Lazarus, come forth" to the dead man. "I and the Father are one." "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." "Father, it is my WILL that they whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold the glory which I had with thee before the world was"—words such as never before or since that time were ever either spoken or attributed by one human being to another.

We have presented to us on the pages of these depositions (the Gospels) as the Man who rose from the dead who so

¹ See Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," citing Amianus Marcellinus as to Julian's abortive attempt to restore the Jewish temple.

^{1a} For a careful consideration of the authenticity of Josephus' mention of Christ see Appendix "D."

spoke and so foretold the future, a person unlike any of the sons of men in His flawless, balanced perfections, as admitted and often even admiringly proclaimed by those who reject His deity, supernaturally profound and keen in His intellect, as evidenced by His recorded speeches and unanswerable debates with the keenest brains of His age, giving every possible evidence of personal humility and absence of fanaticism or excitement, and yet calmly arrogating to Himself divine attributes, authority and honor as a matter of course and never appearing more godlike than when dying as a tortured felon and asserting even from His cross the power to open the gates of paradise before sunset to a dying thief who then and there confessed his faith in Him.

True, we cannot now cross-examine the eye- and ear-witnesses to the words and events narrated in the Gospels, but they were cross-examined at the time as have no other witnesses ever been examined since the world began, by interrogatory and cross-interrogatory, by fire, sword, cross, and scourge. This was their heroic part in the "Holy War," and doubtless it was to afford us of later generations the costly assurance of their truth and sincerity that the early Christians were all Christian martyrs. The witnesses are dead, as are the witnesses to all but the practically current events of the world's profane history, but even aside from the unique weight these writings are entitled to as the only historical records in the world tested by the torture of the historians and of many who accepted their accounts, there is a well-nigh infallible way of ascertaining the truth of the Gospels.

On this point Simon Greenleaf makes an observation which will by the sheer force of its obvious truth compel the assent of every man who will read it carefully enough to grasp it. In his "Testimony of the Evangelists"—before quoted—Greenleaf says: ¹

"After a witness is dead and his moral character is forgotten, we can ascertain it only by a close inspection of his narrative, comparing its details with each other and with contemporary accounts and collateral facts. This test is much more accurate than may at first be supposed. Every event which actually transpires has its appropriate relation and place in the vast complication of circumstances of which the affairs of

¹ "Testimony of the Evangelists," p. 43.

men consist: it owes its origin to the events which have preceded it, is intimately connected with all others which occur at the same time and place, and often with those of remote regions, and in its turn gives birth to numberless others which succeed. In all this almost inconceivable contexture and seeming discord there is perfect harmony; and while the fact which really happened tallies exactly with every other contemporaneous incident related to it in the remotest degree, it is not possible for the wit of man to invent a story which, if closely compared with the actual occurrences of the same time and place, may not be shown to be false."¹

After a lecture at Keswick, New Jersey, a young lady came to me and said she had been on the point of leaving the conference she had been induced to attend, as everything said seemed to be based upon an assumption of the utter truth of Christianity and the Bible—which she did not accept—but that the weight of the observations developed from this quotation from Greenleaf's "Testimony of the Evangelists" had overwhelmed her with astonished conviction; that it went "a hundred miles deeper" than all she had heard and read in her college life against faith in the Bible. She was a teacher at the time in one of the very largest and most famous of women's colleges and had been an honor student before being added to its staff.

The high quality and character of this young lady was proven by the promptness and decisiveness with which she acted upon her just secured mental conviction of the truth of Christ's Gospel. She said, "I want to be a Christian. How do I go about it?" She was advised at once to go by herself and lay her case before the Lord who she now believed was real. That same afternoon she came to me and said she had called upon the Lord Jesus Christ and asked for salvation and gotten it. She changed her whole career forthwith and entered upon a course of study for service as a medical missionary in the foreign field. At the present time she is a successful heart specialist in the city of Philadelphia.

A lawyer on the staff of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who came to be reassured by me as to the loyalty of a client he knew I had represented, found himself talking about these things with me before he left, and was asked if he could conceive of any possibility of such a test of truth misleading. He

¹ Citing "Starkie on Evidence," pp. 496-499.

said he could not, expressed both his astonishment that such a conclusive and available proof of the truth of the Gospel records existed and his intention of joining a class at the Washington Bible Institute and studying Christian Evidences if he could arrange his schedule to do it. Another member of this same "F. B. I." reacted similarly to the same mental stimulus, studied a book I lent¹ him and declared his Christian faith to the lady through whom I met him at dinner, though he left the city and I did not see him again personally.

George Campbell, D. D., principal of the Marshall College, Aberdeen, Scotland, in correspondence between himself and David Hume which has become a much cited classic, wrote a reply to Hume's most astute and philosophically worded argument that it was inherently impossible to produce proof sufficient to offset what he declared was the conclusive presumption against a miracle. In this work entitled "A Dissertation on Miracles" appears a paragraph which has been quoted by leading authorities ever since: Campbell's "Philosophy of Rhetoric," c. v. b. 1, par. 3, p. 125; Whately's "Rhetoric," part 1, ch. 2, par. 4; "Starkie on Evidence," p. 487. The paragraph follows:

"In a number of concurrent testimonies, where there has been no previous concert [utterly negated in the case of the Gospels by the apparent but completely reconciled discrepancies between them. Linton] there is a probability distinct from that which may be termed the sum of the probabilities resulting from the testimony of the witnesses; a probability which would remain even though the witnesses were of such character as to merit no faith at all. This probability arises from the concurrence itself. That such a concurrence should spring from chance is as one to infinity; that is, in other words, morally impossible. If, therefore, concert be excluded, there remains no cause but the reality of the fact."

I have developed this matter somewhat at length in my book the "Sanhedrin Verdict"² and will do no more with it here than to leave it to do its work in any mind into which it really enters.

Now, as to the ample facilities and data with which to cross-

¹ "Many Infallible Proofs," Arthur T. Pierson.

² Loiseaux Bros. Publishers.

examine the Gospels let us remember that the life of Jesus of Nazareth was not lived nor His deeds done in a corner. This life was lived and that death was died at a time and place on the world's stage when it was crowded with epoch-making actors and activities, with which men and events the writers of Christ's biography closely connect all that He said and did. It is clear, therefore, that the means for applying the test of truth set forth by Greenleaf and Campbell exist here not in a measurable but in a superlative degree, for corroborating Greenleaf's statement at page 48 that: "It would be difficult to select any place or period in the history of nations for the time and scene of a fictitious history or an imposture which would combine so many difficulties for the fabricator to surmount, so many contemporary writers to confront him with, and so many facilities for the detection of falsehood," no less a scholar than Mark Hopkins, at page 288 of his "Evidences," deals with this very matter at considerable and illuminating length. He says:

"Time and place of origin.—And here, again, as at other points, the evidence of Christianity shines with a peculiar lustre. It may, indeed, almost be said that our books are credible from the very time and place of their origin. 'Few persons,' says the forcible writer whom I last quoted, 'few persons, perhaps, give due attention to the relative position of the Christian history, which stands upon the very point of the intersection where three distinct lines of history meet—namely, the Jewish, the Grecian, and the Roman. These three bodies of ancient literature, alone, have descended, by an uninterrupted channel of transmission, to modern times; and these three, by a most extraordinary combination of circumstances, were brought together to elucidate the origination of Christianity. If upon the broad field of history there rests the common light of day, upon that spot where a new religion was given to man there shines the intensity of a concentrated brightness.' The Jews had their own literature, they had been formerly conquered by the Greeks, and the Greek language was in common use; they were also a Roman province, and 'during more than a century, in the centre of which stands the ministry of Christ, the affairs of Syria attracted the peculiar attention of the Roman government.' 'No other people of antiquity can be named, upon whose history and sentiments there falls this *triple* flood of historic light; and upon no period in the history of this one people do these triple rays so precisely meet as upon the moment the voice of one was heard in the wilderness of Jordan, saying, 'Prepare ye the way of the Lord.'" ¹ Well, then, might an apostle

¹ "Process of Historical Proof."

say, 'These things were not done in a corner.' The time is not run back, like that of Indian legends, to obscure and fabulous ages; nor is it in what are called the dark ages of more modern times. It was a civilized and an enlightened age—a classic age—an age of poets, philosophers, and historians. Nor was it in Mecca—a city little known or visited by the civilized world, and where the people and language were homogeneous—that Christ arose. It was in Jerusalem, in Western Asia—the theatre of history from the first—and from the bosom of a people with all whose rites and usages we are perfectly acquainted. It was, perhaps, the only place on earth in which a Roman governor would have called upon the three languages which contain the literature of ancient civilization into requisition, to proclaim at once the accusation and the true character of Christ. 'And Pilate wrote a title, and put it on the cross. And the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS. . . . And it was written in *Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin.*'

"Here, then, was a mixed population, with different prejudices and interests, speaking different languages, for that day a reading population, in a city to which not only the Jews dwelling in Palestine, but those from distant countries, and proselytes, came up yearly, as the centre and seat of the only pure worship of God on earth. And was this the place to select for the production of forged writings? or for an imposture of any kind to gather a force that should carry it over the earth?

"I have already spoken of the opportunity furnished by the number and variety of the Christian witnesses for a most searching cross-examination, and we have seen how triumphantly they come out from such an ordeal. And here again they are brought to a test scarcely less trying. The contemporary writers, Jewish and heathen, in the three languages mentioned, are numerous; and whatever, in any of them, throws light on the manners, or habits, or sects, or forms of government, or general condition of the inhabitants of Palestine and the surrounding countries, will enable us to put to a most decisive test those who describe with any minuteness important events passing upon such a scene."

Unless then the axiomatic truth of the statement of Greenleaf, supported by Starkie, another great writer on the subject of evidence, be disputed that "it is not possible for the wit of man to invent a fiction" and so articulate it into the bony framework of real history as to defy detection, or unless, as no educated man will do, the accuracy of Hopkins' historical summary of that period be denied, manifestly we are able even now to test and establish the detailed and literal truth of the Gospels with a certainty which probably only lawyers familiar with the

conclusive results of skilful and prolonged and exhaustive cross-examination can fully apprehend.

This whole line of thought concluded a lecture a few years ago to a group of lawyers belonging to the Bar Association of Northern New Jersey, among whom present were some Jewish lawyers and a Roman Catholic judge. The only words used at the end of the discussion were those of absolute assent to the contention made. Through the courtesy of Dr. Frank P. Eckings, of Paterson, New Jersey, I once had the pleasure and responsibility of speaking to a group or club of professional gentlemen called "The Scholars of the Round Table." These gentlemen were, as I understood, all agnostic in their views and were considering the evening I was with them the question whether "God created us or we create God."

The case for Christianity as to proof was presented along the lines suggested here, with the infallible test of cross-examination as clinching the other proofs, and to the glory of God be it recorded that, under the faithful dealings of Dr. Eckings with a gentleman who had been or was the president of the club, at the end of the lecture this man was converted then and there—obviously converted with the emotional phenomena which often, but not always, accompanies this great event.

Imagine trying to crowd an extra vertebra into a living normal backbone, or the tremendous story of the Man of Calvary, if fiction, into a place in history already fully occupied with real and fully recorded and inseparably linked happenings; and imagine the futility of the effort to remove this towering life and cataclysmic death from the chain of events supporting the history and present condition of Christendom and of the world! The surveyor marks the exact spot for his departure with a cross mark on a stone, and even so God has marked the exact spot when and where the central fact of mankind's history took place by a sharply drawn cross outlined against the eastern sky—that point to which every hope was pointed forward by prophet and priest under the Old Covenant, and back to which every hopeful heart and confident faith and tear-dimmed eye looks in the New—with another look upward, as we eat the symbolical broken bread and drink the poured-out wine and "show the Lord's death till he come."

V

ON GETTING CONVERTED

SOMEWHAT AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL

WHILE I cannot recall a case where a careful reading of even one of the scholarly works on the Christian Evidences failed to overwhelm the reader into conviction, in my case, as with David Nelson, the interest aroused by my discovery of the entire dependability of the information the Bible gives us about a wonderful new life and world—similar to that I imagine with which men heard the reports brought back by Columbus and his followers of the marvelous new world they had visited—led me to search out and mentally devour one after another of the old masterpieces of apologetic writing. Those familiar with the great writers of the 18th century know that "theology" was a subject with which every cultured man concerned himself, whether his views were orthodox or infidel. Christian Evidences was a required major in nearly all early American colleges—and rightly so, for however many branches of learning a man may have studied, if he have not included this, his education is more shallow and incomplete than if he had neglected all others. In an old book published in 1842,¹ in which I have a peculiar interest, I find this contention well put:

"Theology claims the preference to all other studies. To ascertain the character of God in its aspects towards us; to contemplate the display of His attributes in His works and dispensations; to discover His designs towards man in his original state; to learn our duty to Him, the means of enjoying His favour, the hopes which we are authorized to entertain and the wonderful expedient by which our fallen race is restored to purity and happiness; these are the objects of theology, and entitle it to be pronounced the first of all sciences in dignity and importance, and may justly claim the preference to all other studies."

¹ "The Doctrines of Divine Revelation," by Rev. Samuel Helffenstein, D. D. James Kay, Jr. & Bros., 122 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Since Dr. Charles Elliott wrought that thing in American educational life which his friend Dr. Ethelbert Warfield, late president of Wilson College, told me he considered the worst blow it ever suffered (introducing the elective system by which a student chooses the line of least resistance to a degree) the evolutionary-biology, the drunk-or-sober, work-or-loaf, cradle-to-grave-security-sociology and the "borrow-yourself-prosperous, spend-yourself-rich" system of political economy have crowded out study of the credentials and contents of the Book which more than one great statesman of both England and America have declared the secret of their nations' greatness. And it is probable that the neglect of this vital and scholarly subject, even in seminaries where it is now often a side issue, if studied at all, is the reason for such treasonable and "cracked notes" as are sounded from many preachers' trumpets and such panic-stricken willingness to surrender to modernistic infidelity as we find here and there in the ranks of the Lord's army.

Few men will invest life or risk death for a cause about which they have doubts; most men will for one they know is just. Paul knew for an absolute certainty that he had met the Son of God on his way to Damascus and all Rome after that could not silence him and those who believed on Christ through his word. In praying to His Father in the 17th chapter of John our Lord said about His disciples, "They have known surely that I came forth from thee." We also may know surely, though this certainty exacts the price of godly conduct as well as scholarly study. "If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine whether it is of God or I speak of myself." Our Lord intends His soldiers to be so sure of the blessed, thrilling things which transformed His "scattered-like-sheep" disciples into such men as lion-hearted Peter who never lost an occasion to throw into the teeth of those rulers who killed his Lord, "Whom ye slew, whom God raised from the dead" (the most terrific and fearless charge ever brought by a man against a judicial tribunal) that it will be perfectly natural for us to "stand fast in the Lord," to "quit us like men," "to be strong," as scarred and battered, exultant Paul enjoins. And shall we Christians be so pallidly dubious about our orthodox, historic, evangelical Christianity that we hasten to shout "Comarade"

and accept into our friend- and fellowship those who cast aspersions on the legitimacy of the birth of our Prince and deny His "crown-rights" as "only Potentate, King of kings and Lord of lords"? Doubtless we will if we are unsure about them ourselves; but since no one need be uncertain, as our Lord's family tree and royal line of descent are matters of record, confirmed by the deeds which only the divine scion of that line could do, it is little short of treason to be lukewarm about this issue. "It has an ill look when the King's courtiers are too friendly with the King's enemies" (Spurgeon).

In the easy days of a decade or two ago it was felt and contended that we had no need of a real Sovereign and Saviour at all and that in view of the good progress men and evolution had made since that start in a mud puddle (for which manifestly neither gratitude nor duty to any god was owed) we "had the situation well in hand" and an inspiring legend about a fictitious person named Jesus was just as good as a reality. "If He Never Lived, What of That?" asked Mrs. Pearl Buck in a widely read magazine article.¹ Here is a case "proven beyond a reasonable doubt" yet held by many believers as doubtfully true and by infidels as undoubtedly false. It has long been so. Here is what I find written in one of my books that, bound in vellum, was a treasured volume in the library of Justice Stephen J. Field, one of the great members of the Supreme Court of the United States when it consisted of men chosen for outstanding legal ability. The book is "Butler's Analogy," written in 1736. Its study used to be the trial and test of the senior class of my old college.

"It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry, but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious. And accordingly they treat it as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all persons of discernment, and nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were, by way of reprisal for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world."

When it is remembered that this was written not long before the great revivals and work of the Wesleys, Whitefield and

¹ For the writer's reply to which question see Appendix "E."

Jonathan Edwards and note some of the admissions made in prominent pulpits and in the newspapers about the failure of agnosticism and the "lush" and hazy teachings of Modernism when confronted with the desperate needs of mankind today, may not the Christians who have prayed for many years hope that the history of revival in America following the desperate wickedness and unbelief of post-Revolutionary days is about to be repeated?

But sustained revival needs scholarly, intellectual conviction as well as emotional fervor for the Holy Spirit to use in upholding its leaders, and as David Nelson's "Cause and Cure of Infidelity" led me to the first, as the basis of any trace of the latter I have ever enjoyed I should tell something about him.

I do not stress Nelson because his work is pre-eminent by any means among the Christian apologists, but because he is so interestingly, if discursively, written, and because he introduced me to all the others. Furthermore he is the man who Dr. Howard A. Kelly in his great book "A Scientific Man and the Bible" says had a great influence on his young life; and his book is the one which my dear old friend, and Moody's dear friend and Wilbur Chapman's dear friend and John McNeil's dear friend, dear old John Robertson, the great preacher of Glasgow, Scotland, said was the turning point in his life.

I was telling John Robertson how one day in college I "happened" to pull out of the library shelves a shabby copy of an old book called "Nelson on Infidelity" and how after reading one paragraph I took it with me and read it surreptitiously all through a mathematics class and had been interested in the subject there dealt with ever since. As I said this Rev. General John Robertson struck his hands together and said, "Irwin, that book was the turning point in my life." And there he was, after some fifty years of world-famous and heaven-filling preaching, still following along the orbit into which his life had swung when it fell under the influence of that old book.

David Nelson was not originally a preacher but a doctor, and not in early life a Christian but an infidel. He writes that of the two things that made him a Christian one was the reading of infidel works in search of good grounds for his unbelief, and the other was his constant attendance at deathbeds of both

Christians and unbelievers and the data he gathered as a result. He deals discriminatingly with what he saw.

He noticed that while there was no consistency in the data to be gathered from the attitude of saint and sinner when they *thought* they were dying, there was absolute uniformity in their divergent experiences and reactions when they were really dying; and his logical mind made it impossible for him to find any theory to fit all the facts except one which was unsettling to his infidelity. Summing up the result of his careful and protracted study of both infidel and Christian authors in telling of his conversion he writes (p. 297):

"Let not the reader suppose that I could say undoubtingly, 'I believe this book to be the Book of God' even after it had been proved to me in different ways a hundred times. Physicians say of the body of man that it is formed into habits. . . . Many of the habits of the flesh run on even when opposed by our enlightened wishes. Habits of infidelity often exist . . . after an instructed judgment tells us better. The feeling of my heart made it necessary that I should continue to read after I could say in truth concerning the Bible, 'I have more evidence a hundredfold that this is God's letter than I have of any past occurrence which I did not see.' In connection with Scott, I read Bonnett's 'Inquiries,' Paley, Watson, Chalmers, etc., and was pleased and astonished to see them all evince the meekness and modesty and benevolent forbearance which struck me in the author first named.

"They all instructed me. This investigation went on for many months. The considerations which agitated my mind, raising or sinking it, swaying me to the right or the left while this reading and research went on, shall be commenced in the next chapter. For the present I wish to say to the Christian reader—for the unbeliever could not understand me—I wish to say in the language of another that which no sinner ever deserved to have the privilege of saying—that which, if any ever deserved to have no permission to pronounce, I have thus deserved; but with my face in the dust, while a joy unexpressible fills my soul, I can say: 'I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand in the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms shall destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself and mine eyes shall behold, and not another.' "

David Nelson's conversion went through his head to his heart; so with me. Ill it had been with both of us if it had penetrated no further than the first organ and left us in the company of the thoroughly convinced "devils who also believe and tremble." Though this book so stresses intellectual conviction, this

is but the first, as it should be and often is an inevitable, step to heart conversion—though here we venture upon holy ground where the most convinced believer is absolutely dependent upon the Holy Spirit.

Emerson or Ruskin somewhere observes that there is profit in knowing the absolutely true record of the humblest life, in which are inevitably illustrated the working of the laws of cause and effect; especially is this true if the hand of God may be discerned in directing or interposing.

Though, through no fault of my own, I was born in Washington, D. C., and my father's family was so located on both sides of the Potomac as to be disastrously involved in the War between the States (to the great physical detriment especially of the uncle who lost several duplicate but useful parts in the course of his service as one of J. E. B. Stuart's cavalymen), both my father's and my mother's families originated in Philadelphia, which my first American Linton ancestor abandoned an Episcopalian English rectorship to turn Quaker and help William Penn found, to which city a later preacher forbear, less warlike than the lapsed Quaker who froze his toes in company with Washington's at Valley Forge, returned after his Fort-Sumpter-induced zeal for military service had been extinguished by the cold he caught the first night he slept on the ground, with the plausible explanation to inquiring friends and relatives that 'war did not agree with him.'

My strict upraising excluded even the inside of a circus; but it did include what was infinitely better, being taken boating and sailing with my father as soon as I was long enough to stick out of both ends of a life-preserver. My parents both believed in the doctrine of original sin, at least after my birth; and doubtless I am under a greater debt of gratitude than I have ever felt to the "cat-o'-nine-tails" which (I have jokingly contended to my parents after the birth of their first grandchild seemed to destroy their "natural hue of resolution" about child raising) was hung in a place so central and convenient to the hand that anyone who needed exercise and "felt their spirits stirred within them" might use it in giving me the benefit of their disciplinary ministrations. More helpful than the largely psychological contacts of the cat-o'-nine-tails however was the exhilarating exam-

ple and activities of my genial, devoted, devout, seafaring, horseback-riding lawyer-father who made it easy for me to absorb his views that smoking and drinking were feeble-minded vices that a young man started only because he was a fool and a mature man continued only because he had been one. Card playing, dancing and theatre-going were things simply not done in good Presbyterian society, Episcopalianism, from which the family had departed several generations back by way of Revolutionary-War-abandoned Quakerism, being suggested as the denomination to adopt if one cared to risk security for the life to come for somewhat greater indulgence in the one that now is. And it so happens that now with middle age in sight—behind me—atavism or the beauty of the service—especially the Communion Service—makes me one of the most appreciative worshippers every summer at the very Episcopal churches that used to be served by the rectors who lived before the Revolution in my old "Glebe" of Cople Parish, in one of which, Yeocomico, Mary Washington had her infant George baptized (or "christened" as a good Baptist brother of mine insisted after estimating the quart of water the font would hold and remembering George's both infant and adult amplitude). I am sure therefore, that there will not be questioned the gratitude I feel to this great Denomination which gave us Paley and Watson and Bishop Moule and Canon Howitt and many of the ablest eighteenth century "defenders of the faith" or the affection with which we Presbyterians will continue to be "a sister to them," even if we never consummate the marriage they so flatteringly now urge upon us.

I "joined the church" when I was about twelve years old, following meetings for children conducted by Rev. E. Payson Hammond. I recall that my heart was stirred at the time and that I felt more secure against "going to the bad place" if I died unexpectedly, a dread that operates more generally in children's hearts than I think is often realized. Whether I was born again at that time I do not know. The most definite point of departure for my Christian life came many years later when in college. I have intimated how this came about. How it came to pass that I went to this particular splendid old, but for me most unlikely college, seems a remarkable instance of foreordi-

nation and God's taking the trouble to direct the steps of the humblest of His children—at least when they are "children of the Covenant" as, by the grace of God and the piety of my parents, I was—and as any parents by their love and obedience to God can make their children to be also.

Nothing but the decree of God, I suppose, could have prevented me from enjoying the benefits of going to the University of Pennsylvania—because whatever these might have been, He had greater ones for me elsewhere. At the University of Pennsylvania my great-grandfather graduated in 1800, as valedictorian of his class, as his diploma which I have shows, and he was only one of the family who did so. My mother had often told inattentive children about him and about his father who had preached so pungently in the old Market Square Church at Germantown, during the British occupation of Philadelphia, to the Hessian soldiers from the text "Ye have sold yourselves for naught" that a much needed bodyguard had been generously supplied by the British officers after the service; but only the other day, now that she is herself ninety years old, did she tell me of the sermon his son, her grandfather, had preached when he too was ninety to the congregation whose tears and sobs could not be restrained as they listened to the quavering tones of the old saint who urged them to continue along the path he had followed so close to its end. I had known about the seminary he had conducted in his own home, after the manner of the day, for students for the ministry, one of whom was the founder of the "Winebrennerians," for his name had produced quite a commotion when I mentioned it after speaking in a Winebrennerian church some years ago in Western Maryland. My mother also had told me of her own ministerial father and of the first sermon he preached to his congregation after returning from his wedding trip, on the somewhat unfortunately chosen text "Oh, that it were with me as in times past," and of her preacher uncles, one of whom, a bachelor, once made a petition from the pulpit that he be favored with no more pairs of spinster-woven slippers, his facilities for wearing and storing these articles being exhausted; and another of whom had led, or misled whichever way it is, the aforementioned old Market Square Church from its German

Reformed moorings into the Presbyterianism to which it still adheres.

Only since starting this book, however, have I gotten acquainted with the old great-grandfather whose book I quoted at the beginning of this chapter; and now I have a real affection for him and longing to meet him, as my first study of the old book I had all my life seen in my father's library and consequent contact with his heart and mind has brought him closer to me than his aquiline, long-nosed picture had ever done. I would doubtless have rendered a greater service if I had republished this century old book, which was formerly used in Princeton and elsewhere as a textbook, than in trying to write a new one; and it seems that the predilection of my maternal line for the ministry is proving prepotent in my old age over that of my father's family for law and the sea. One of the joys of the next life will doubtless be going back up the line and getting acquainted with our redeemed ancestors, in spite of the gaps, clear back to Adam. As we read in the Bible how great was God's patience and goodness to the ignoble descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, just because they were scions of his friends, we realize how kind our God is when He gives us godly ancestors and the opportunity to be godly ancestors to our descendants.

Oh, God of Bethel, by Whose hand Thy people still are fed,
 Who through this dreary wilderness hast all our fathers led,
 Our vows, our prayers we now present before Thy throne of grace,
 God of our fathers be the God of their succeeding race.

But at the University of Pennsylvania or any other state college any copy they have of Nelson on the "Cause and Cure of Infidelity" is probably so far back on the shelves that it is to be wondered if any student has run across it in the last hundred years or so. The God who "wings an angel, guides a sparrow" intended that I should see the bright contents of that dingy old book in the library of Erskine College—the oldest and many of us think the most famous of the church colleges in the South—and manifestly, since it happened that way, that I should meet a certain young lady who was the daughter of its recently deceased president; for the God who acted as "shatkin" for Isaac and Ruth the Moabitess can assuredly be counted on to take an

equal interest in the lives of His children now. (I have not been interested in evangelizing Jews for the last twenty years without learning something of their words and ways.) The night before I left for college the young lady next door broke the news to me that she was going to marry an army officer son of Senator Sewel, of New Jersey—for whose donated racing cup I sailed many a boat later on Barnegat Bay—and made the comforting prediction that I would “fall in love with a blue-eyed golden-haired southern girl.” While it seems to me extremely improbable that the spirit of real prophecy ever descended upon a gay, young female Episcopalian, it so happened that the first girl I met at college was in my eyes and an uncomfortably large number of others the fairest young woman of that color scheme that God ever developed out of “hominy grits” and the Shorter Catechism since He introduced Adam to Eve—though Eve’s diet and education were, of course, along entirely different lines.

That I am sentimental is obviously undeniable; but then so is our beloved brother “Billy Ridgeway” as everyone who notes his frequent references to “El Nedito” in his “Corner” of the *Sunday-School Times* knows, and so was my dear deceased brother Charles Trumbull, who more than once exchanged confidences with me as to the happiness the devotion of our wives had brought to us—to mention the first two who occur to me—and so is our God Himself. “The light of a whole life dies when love is done”; and I do not believe that God intended romantic attachment to be merely a lure to snare men and women into matrimony, but planned that it should brighten life throughout and be never deeper than at the final moment of parting here, before renewed companionship in Paradise gives us back more than the idyllic happiness of Adam and Eve during their brief innocent honeymoon in Eden. One of the most endearing things about our God is that He also is sentimental, as can be known by the laws He has given us to promote and guide us in the exercise of our affections, by His supervising match-making activities in the lives of Isaac and Ruth and many others; by His declaring His jealousy of our affections and frequent appeals for their warm expression toward Him; by the gifts with which He woos us and the “wonders of creation, works with skill and kindness wrought,” with which

He seeks to arouse our admiration for His power and artistry: snowflake patterns, all different, just to show us what He can do; sunsets, flowers and their odors, birds with their graceful beauty and variety of heart-touching plaintive songs, the symmetry of the human form and beauty of the human countenance at its best; the joys of friendship and sprightly zest which underlies human existence just from the fact that there are two slightly different sexes, the infinite intricacy and skill with which our world is adapted to us¹ and the glorious perfection of the sky² as a canopy over us, with its translucent spaciousness giving us an exalted sense of freedom from being covered while its fleecy clouds supply a canvas for sunset paintings and relieve what might otherwise oppress by an appearance of emptiness—and above all by the romantic plot of the great drama of redemption—a plot so dramatic that Milton chose it in preference to the romantic legends about King Arthur, after careful consideration, for the plot of "Paradise Lost and Regained," the world's greatest poem.

Now it is perfectly clear why I went to Erskine College, as it will be clear to my Christian readers at the end of their lives why every single thing they have done and experienced so happened. If a man could only have the comfort of seeing and rejoicing in God's guidance along his predestined path as clearly at the beginning as toward the end of his life! But then a distress or perplexity could hardly be real enough to do its chastening and strengthening work if we knew in advance it was to have a "good end"; and since faith is what brings down from God all His blessings for time and eternity, let us welcome, or at least endure bravely, whatever is necessary for its development. No matter how many scores of things have turned out for the best in the past, however, a danger or problem ahead fills our foreboding eyes fuller than all those behind, so doubtless the faith of all of us will be well exercised up to the very moment when our fading sight focuses on the angel sent to escort us to heaven.

At Due West—the ancient colonial name of the town of

¹ See Dr. Arthur I. Brown's "God the Architect." B. H. Shadduck's "Mistakes God Did Not Make." Paley's "Natural Theology."

² See Essay by John Ruskin on "The Sky."

which Erskine is the brain and heart—I learned to sing and love so deeply the metrical version of the Psalms that many have enriched my memory and the "Let a little sunshine in" type of hymn has been distasteful to me ever since. In this old town scholarship and piety seemed mutually to excel each other. The Sabbath Day, as the day of the Lord's resurrection is there called, is kept as if they thought the Lord really meant the Fourth Commandment. Here the sight and smell of a woman with a cigarette drooling out of her mouth never incites to that feeling of mingled pity and contempt which has nauseated man's former sense or at least pretense of gallantry almost to extinction elsewhere. Here, when there is a drought, they pray for rain, and they used to take an umbrella to church with them when the praying was to be done by Dr. William Pressly. The graduates of this college have been honor men almost without exception in every university where they have done post graduate work, and in about fifteen years the students did their proportionate share of winning oratorical contests for one hundred and twenty-four years. Is not the explanation of the fact that this college, like Hampden-Sidney, in Virginia, of like kind, has contributed so disproportionately large a number of men to the ranks of distinction and "Who's Who" recognition, that here Bible study is still a required major, since we have the Bible's own word for it that "The entrance of thy word giveth light" and "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom"?

After reading Nelson day and night following my introduction to his old book in the dim corridor of the college library that autumn day, I experienced a deep conviction of sin. I had known before in a general way that I was a sinner, but now it seemed to me that never before had such a sinner, especially a sinner against such light and knowledge as had been my portion, presumed to hope for forgiveness. Satan told me I had undoubtedly committed the "unpardonable sin," as I surmise he has told just about everyone, and I recalled childhood efforts, once especially during family worship, not to "blaspheme against the Holy Ghost"—something which I erroneously thought consisted in thinking certain words in your heart, even

if you never expressed them—and how desperately I tried not even to think them.

Bunyan's "Grace Abounding" was a book I read with great feeling and interest, often walking alone in the woods. I recall lying on my face across my bed for long periods at a time while the thought of my desperately wicked heart and mind overwhelmed me with black despair. I do not recall any very definite moment when the darkness lifted. It seems just gradually to have disappeared like a sea fog when the sun burns through it. I already knew Christ and the way of salvation perfectly in theory, and it seems possible to me that I was really converted as a child and that the deepening of my sense of sin and whole religious experience was merely the natural result of fuller apprehension of the realities of religion growing out of the impression its proofs made upon me. The absolutely universal terms of the offer of salvation and pardon and such phrases as "him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out"; "though your sins be as scarlet they shall be white as snow"; "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin"; "if we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness"; "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in thine heart that God raised him from the dead thou shalt be saved"—finally brought peace and assurance, and in whatever depression of spirit I have often walked since I have not, I think, ever really doubted that I was saved and "an heir of salvation." The corollary of such statements as that "Ye must be born again" and "Is passed from death unto life" has always seemed to me to be that no really born-again one can ever be "unborn," for we are told when we are born we are born unto eternal life.

The doctrine of predestination has always been of the greatest comfort to me. It has seemed inescapably proven by the very fact of exact, detailed fulfilled prophecy, among other things; for how could the future be told unless it were known or known unless it were certain, or certain unless it were fixed and who fixed it but God? I believe it was intended for the comfort and assurance of all saved people. Sinners have nothing to do with this insight which the Scriptures give us into God's eternal

ways and purposes. To the unsaved the word is: "Whosoever will may come"; but to the sinner who has come and who fears he may fall away before he finally reaches the end of the journey the word is: "Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son." "Fear not: for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine"

VI

GETTING CONVINCED

THIS chapter on getting convinced follows, it may seem somewhat illogically, that on getting converted. I don't know exactly the moment when I was converted. I often wish I did, as some do. But better than the memory recording of a past event for any of us is the present assurance that now we 'know whom we have believed and are persuaded that he is able to keep that which we have committed unto him against that day'; and, by the grace of God, this I have.

I do know, however, the time and the process by which I became so utterly convinced of the truth of the unseen realities of the spiritual life and world that they became an active element in my mental, emotional and social life—leading me to ignore the worldly convention which declares it "bad taste to talk about religion" and the well realized fact that doing so exposes a man to the charge of being a "hypocrite" with some deep hidden design (as unfortunately may sometimes be the case). As to this, however, the wise Scotch Christian lawyer Thomas Erskine remarks, "that man is a fool who throws away his soul because another man is a hypocrite"; and in course of time I have had the experience of hearing some of my worldly "following-the-hounds" friends ask me sincerely, "Irve, what does the Bible say is going to happen next?"—the query of a former law associate recently cited for gallantry in a tank action as a colonel with General Patton in Africa—a dear friend who is on my prayer list for physical and eternal salvation.

Getting convinced is a useful, and in the case of many of the highly educated men with whom I am in contact often essential, first step to that calling upon God for salvation which He has promised to heed. It is the call that brings the answer of eternal pardon, not the conviction which follows this answer or which may be used as an inducement to make the call. There

are, however, degrees of at least mental conviction, and producing a sufficient degree of it in the unsaved to induce the call upon the name of the Lord and in the Christian to make it impossible for him ever again to be at ease while friends and associates around him are dying without Christ, is a result which my observation and experience prove to me often can be produced by a real study of Christian Evidences.

Many people go through life without much restlessness of mind over the "difficulties" involved in Christian faith. Unbelievers often live and die utterly ignoring the insuperable difficulties involved in their unbelief; but in the course of arriving at the restful assurance that there is nothing a Christian is called upon to believe that is not easier and more rational to believe than to disbelieve, a man trained in the skeptical, proof-demanding profession of the law, especially if there is in him a trace of the theological, consecrated cantankerousness of the Scotch blood (illustrated by Cromwell's famous petition to his fellow Calvinists in Scotland: "I beseech thee by the mercies of the Beloved to try to conceive of the possibility of being wrong") finds it hard to stop pondering these problems, in the instinctive knowledge that all aspects of truth are consistent and that all things really done and revealed by God will be found if probed deeply enough to have this consistency.

After finishing "Nelson on the Cause and Cure of Infidelity" I went to the president of the theological seminary connected with my college and asked for books on the "Evidences." With joy he got me out of his library Paley's "Evidences," Paley's "Natural Theology," and Paley's "Horae Paulinae."

This last is a book that no infidel has ever even tried to answer. It especially appeals to a law-trained man, for it is a keen cross-examination of the Epistles of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles for those subtle, undesigned, impossible-to-manufacture correspondences and agreements in minute details which only truth running through diverse testimony or writings can produce. Everyone who has listened to lawyers cross-examining witnesses in court has doubtless wondered why they took the time and trouble to ask such unimportant, trifling questions. There is a reason. False witnesses can agree in advance on

many things about their story—the main things about which they can anticipate being questioned; but they cannot anticipate the trifling, unimportant details. The possibilities are too innumerable, and harmony in these small and unexpected matters is more significant than agreement in salient, pertinent things. The first can be artificially produced; the second cannot. If the testimony of several witnesses agrees on a large number of such matters, they are infallibly telling the truth. Paul in his letters and Luke in his history agree, and are found on study to be in harmony in regard to almost numberless humanly undesigned, incidental things, and, as no one on earth can dispute, this fact alone proves that both writings are true and grew out of real happenings. If you love careful reasoning, read the "*Horae Paulinae*." It is not thrilling to your heart, but it is to your head. See also Dr. R. A. Torrey's fine work on "*The Bible and Its Christ*" for his consideration of this line of thought with reference to the resurrection.

Probably everyone is familiar with the charge often brought against the Bible by both its ignorant and its educated enemies that it "is full of mistakes and contradictions"; but those who are acquainted with the works of Dr. Robert Dick Wilson and James Orr and even with that deservedly popular book of Dr. Torrey's dealing with this matter, "*Difficulties and Alleged Errors and Contradictions in the Bible*," know how convincingly specific allegations of this kind have been cleared up on investigation. A characteristically profound observation of Paley¹ is well worth remembering in this connection:

"Now, in historical researches, a reconciled inconsistency becomes a positive argument. First, because an impostor generally guards against the appearance of inconsistency; and secondly, because when apparent inconsistencies are found, it is seldom that anything but truth renders them capable of reconciliation. The existence of the difficulty proves the want or absence of that caution which usually accompanies the consciousness of fraud; and the solution proves that it is not the collusion of fortuitous propositions which we have to deal with, but that a thread of truth winds through the whole, which preserves every circumstance in its place."

¹ "*Horae Paulinae*," p. 135.

The frank and artless narratives of the Bible are so obviously indifferent to the *appearance* of consistency, and show so clearly that irregularity which is the sure mark of honest handwork in the Oriental rug and of spontaneity in human testimony, that they have often lured opponents into attempts at destructive cross-examination which have only brought the Bible's truth and consistency into clearer light. Think of a proposition (the inerrancy of the Bible) so fortified that not only do all assaults on its walls rebound with deadly momentum upon the heads of its enemies, but that even the things hurled against it have but added to the substance of the bulwarks which protect the faith of its friends!

Later I absorbed Alexander's "Evidences," Butler's "Analogy," Chalmers' "Astronomical Discourses," Hopkins' "Evidences," Flint's "Theism," Erskine's "Internal Evidences," Lyttelton's "Conversion of St. Paul," Faber's "Difficulties of Infidelity," besides Voltaire's works and those of Paine, Spencer, and Huxley, and Hume's "Essay on Miracles" and other infidel books, just to see if any of them, and those advocating evolution, really had anything to offset the proofs the Bible offered. With me, as with Dr. Nelson, the study of these books and others holding to a partial view of inspiration merely made me the better satisfied with the conclusion I had come to that the Bible was indeed God's inspired and infallible Word. Another result is a realization of how far from original are the ideas now being announced as new and profounder and more scientific views about Christ and the Bible by "men of modern mind," every one of which is to be found more clearly, forcefully, and honestly set forth in the writings of frank infidels of centuries past.

One phase of my experience and mental travail at this time is probably worth mentioning, as I have since found so many young people reassured by having it faced boldly and in detail.

Acceptance of the Bible as not only inspired (as were Shakespeare and Homer, the Modernist hastens to explain, in a possibly lesser degree), but inerrant, exposes such a wide flank for attack that before one has serene confidence in his position he must necessarily experience some of the trepidation which that great scholar Robert Dick Wilson confesses used to seize

him when he undertook to investigate (as only he did investigate, having deciphered literally thousands of clay tablets to settle one small point jauntily assumed by a famous destructive critic to be just the opposite of what Dr. Wilson found the fact to be) some question involving the Bible's inerrancy, until one experience after another showed him that the Bible had nothing to fear—except neglect. While I knew it was true that, if a matter is affirmatively proved, it makes no difference how many apparent difficulties remain unsolved, and that this truth is acted on in chemistry, physics, and every secular science, nevertheless an unsolved difficulty or apparent contradiction seemed to fester in my mind like a splinter until I cleared it up.

I remember I had to find out how it was that Abraham was said in one place to have paid one price for his wife's tomb and in another a much larger price. I found out that the explanation of the fact was that it wasn't so! Whereas in one place he bought the tomb, in the other place he appears to have bought later the "field of the sons of Amor the Hittite," doubtless to give greater security to his loved wife's resting place. I still recall the deep difficulty presented by the fact that two different burial places were mentioned in connection with Aaron—a contradiction as deadly to faith in the inerrancy of the Bible as it would be to confidence in the accuracy of two historians, one of whom declared Washington to have been buried at Mount Vernon and the other in Virginia!

In one of the last of the issues of the *Literary Digest* I saw the picture and read the statement of a "bishop" (that lets Presbyterians and Baptists out anyway) that all churchmen knew there was a forgery in the Bible, in that the word "brother" was inserted into the text to reconcile the contradiction as to who killed Goliath, David and Elhanan both being given the honor. From long experience, this admission by a high officer in the Lord's army did not alarm me but only stirred my interest to "look at the record." Unlike most instances of forgery I found the word "brother" was in italics, suggesting that something other than necessity had made this man use the word "forgery" in referring to the Bible, as forgers do the opposite of advertising their alteration of a writing. The necessity of the whole admission disappeared when I found that

there were several strapping boys in the Goliath family and that instead of this one being identical with the one David slew, another verse of the Bible even gave his first name "Larmi"; from which episode I drew the inference that no matter how many ecclesiastical titles and petticoats a man might wear, his words were to be regarded with contempt if they in any wise differed from the Lord's own often-expressed high regard for the Bible, and that high ecclesiastical position is no guaranty whatever that there does not exist in the heart that emotional antipathy to an infallible Bible inherent in any unconverted heart—whether that of a burglar or a bishop.

My faith almost foundered at one time over the statement of Christ recorded in Matthew that certain things there foretold should all happen before that generation passed away; but finally I had the lucid idea of looking this matter up in an orthodox commentary; and instead of telling what I then found out, I suggest that my readers look this up for themselves and get the habit.

Such rudimentary matters as those which remained unsolved in the mind of the well-known criminal lawyer who sought to reduce Mr. Bryan's orthodoxy to absurdity at the evolution trial in Tennessee once bothered me also—in my very young days. It will be recalled that Mr. Bryan was asked if he believed that the sun stood still above the horizon at Joshua's command, as recorded in the Bible, and on Mr. Bryan's hearty affirmative answer Mr. Darrow sneered the further question whether Mr. Bryan did not know that the sun did not move but that the earth did, and that if the alleged phenomenon took place by the stopping of the earth every person and thing on it would be precipitated into space. I do not remember Mr. Bryan's reply, but if he didn't he could have countered with the question whether his examiner did not yet know that the earth and not the sun moved, and if so why he doubtless spoke that morning of the sun rising, as even scientific publications do to this day; and furthermore, as to the earth and its impedimenta parting company if the sun's stay above the horizon was prolonged, if Mr. Darrow did not know that, just as people in an automobile would leave it suddenly if the speeding car were instantly arrested, they would not even leave their seats if it were slowed

down from sixty to ten miles an hour and then speeded up again—a method of accomplishing the result doubtless too abstruse to have occurred to Mr. Darrow, but which it was possible might have occurred to the Almighty, who may have as good control over the earth He made as a man has over the automobile he has bought.

Mr. Bryan was asked if he believed God made a woman out of mud or dust, which might have been answered by the question whether cremation and ultimate dissolution does not prove that this is exactly what she is made out of (God, not the mud, being the important factor), and in what respect he could claim superiority for his own darling belief that our wives and mothers are but accidentally modified snakes, and that, purely as a result of blind chance, two identical sparks of life should in one case remain an unchanged diphtheria germ and in the other develop into a Baptist or Democrat or attain the physical and spiritual perfection of a Madame Guyon—the trick in Mr. Darrow's question lying in the fact that any specific effort to visualize the act and process of creation brings us into contact with the stupefying wonder of the sheer existence of the material universe.

In case any of my readers feel that they know, have read, or have heard of objections to faith which make it rationally impossible as an "outworn superstition," I make this general suggestion: Is it likely that such obvious things as may occur to you have been entirely overlooked and left unanswered in the minds of such men as James Orr, and Gresham Machen, and Robert Dick Wilson, and Sir William Ramsay—to mention only a few of the hundreds of scholars who have devoted a lifetime to a study of these matters?

But this remark savors of that deference to authority to which independent Protestant-minded "freethinkers" object; and at the risk of having the old adage paraphrased to say that "Lawyers rush in where angels fear to tread" in presuming to attempt as did Milton, "to justify the ways of God to man," I beg to submit some of the reflections which have gone through my mind about other problems of orthodox faith, garnered, of course (as each generation does from the preceding), from so

many different sources that their very origin is forgotten. It is not necessary at all to understand God's infinitely wise and reasonable ways, but nothing more invigorates and informs the mind than meditating upon every word and act of God.

VII

FACING DIFFICULTIES OF BELIEF

HUMAN SUFFERING

"EITHER God cannot prevent suffering, in which case He is impotent, or He can but does not, in which case He is evil; or He neither can nor cares, in which case He is both evil as well as impotent." With these words the president of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism declared Epicurus bottled God up forever. Emotionally, even if not intellectually, one of the hardest problems the believer in an all-loving and merciful God has to contend with is how a Being with power to stop such unspeakable mental and physical suffering as the world is now undergoing can sit quiet and let it continue for a moment: the martyrs, Ridley and Joan of Arc, denied sufficiently dry faggots even for their fiery deaths, the tortures inflicted by the Gestapo and the Ogpu now and the Inquisition in days of old and the things done to Jews and war prisoners at the present time! The heart finds no answer, except in the reflection that as Christ "despised the shame" and suffering of the cross because of the joy that was set before Him, so we are assured by St. Paul, who knew suffering at first hand, that "the sufferings of this present time are not to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us"; that the capacity of human beings for joy in the next life and the glorified body will be as infinitely greater than the possibility of suffering here as the duration of heavenly felicity is longer than even protracted suffering here; but with our minds we can readily conceive that, just as a mother might allow her small child, fascinated by fire, to touch it for an instant so that ever afterward it might be safe from courting its danger, so God allows His sentient, free-agent creatures to touch the fiery thing sin, so that throughout the eternity to follow all

the intelligent, free beings of the universe may be sin-proof free agents—as free as Adam was in the Garden but forever safe from sinning, as he was not. The comparatively few thousand years that conservative scholars, such as George Frederick Wright and others,¹ show conclusively (evolutionary theories to the contrary notwithstanding) mankind has been on the earth seem long, but they are but the tick of a clock as compared with the blessed eternity to follow. In the meantime we have for our comfort the divine assurance “My grace is sufficient for thee”; that “God shall wipe away the tears from all eyes,” and that in the time just ahead “there shall be no more death neither sorrow nor crying neither shall there be any more pain.”

How good is the news the Bible gives us that the natural state of this vast universe and the beings in it is not one of endless bitter struggle, pain, frustration, death, but of infinite beauty and joy, the present state of affairs being but a temporary delirium tolerated for a good purpose! With the greatness of God's love and desire to bestow happiness shown by the sacrifice of Christ, His avowed intention of so doing many times repeated in the Bible and His power to do so intimated by the beauty still left and the joy often experienced still in this ravished, sin-soaked, grave-billowed world, even such a glimpse as was confidentially accorded St. Paul of the “rapture that impels” would doubtless disable us, if we shared it, with something of that nostalgia which made him willing to remain in this “vale of tears” only because his converts needed his spiritual ministrations! Now to consider some more of the problems of orthodox belief.

IMMORAL ACTS RECORDED IN THE BIBLE

The problem presented by the fact that in the Holy Bible are related some of the most unholy things committed by sinful human beings has been made the basis of more than one infidel attack on the belief in the divine origin of the Bible. An advertising circular about a book called “The Bible Unmasked” led to an exchange of letters between the author and me which

¹ “Antiquity of Man,” Geo. Frederick Wright. “Evolution Mathematically Disproved,” Wm. K. Williams.

appears as Appendix "C." I refer to that in lieu of discussing the problem here.

THE "UNCHRISTIAN GOD OF THE OLD TESTAMENT"

A Modernist preacher once declared heatedly to me that he utterly repudiated "the God of the Old Testament" and that his God was the God of the New Testament, because in the Old Testament God is stated to have ordered the execution of a whole wicked race. He did not seem to feel that he should hold in execration a human judge who sentenced a criminal to death or to think that it was inconsistent to refuse to concede the Creator and Judge of all mankind power and authority to enforce just laws equal to those possessed by the judge of a criminal court. Also he was reminded that since under the regime of the "God of the New Testament" every man, woman and child of us is under the death sentence, and that we all die sooner or later as did the Canaanites, the only difference being that whereas we die at different times and places and different ways they all died at the same time and place and in the same way, his basis for rejecting God as revealed in the Old as contrasted with the New Testament was not at all substantial.

I think there are few who, since the infinite cruelties and injustices of Hitler and Hirohito have shocked the world, do not now rather rejoice in than repudiate the rigorously just God revealed in the Old Testament, one of the foundations of whose throne is inflexible righteousness.

Who among the allied nations does not rejoice in the fact declared by the 93rd Psalm of which the old Scotch paraphrase runs as follows:

Jehovah sits enthroned in majesty most bright,
 Appareled in omnipotence and girded round with might.
 The earth established stands on its foundations broad.
 His throne is fixed, He reigns supreme,
 The everlasting Lord.
 The waves have lifted up their voice in majesty,
 But mighty is the Lord our God above the raging sea.

And in a secular newspaper a few days ago an editorial quoted the second Psalm:

Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?

The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed, saying,

Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.

He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision.

Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure.

Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion.

I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.

Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.

Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.

Be wise now therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth.

Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling.

Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.

But those who read the Old Testament with diligence know that the Almighty is revealed therein as a most tender, compassionate adorable Being: "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering and abundant in goodness and truth . . . forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty"; as "the High and Holy One who dwelleth in the high and holy place, with him also who is of a humble and contrite heart, to revive the heart of the humble and revive the spirit of the contrite ones."

Who, if he had the power, would want to change anything about such a God?

"Thus saith the Lord, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches: but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment and righteousness in the earth, for in these things do I delight, saith the Lord."¹ How obviously just to have sufficient understanding

¹ Jer. 9: 23-4.

and information to know that there really is such a God transcends all conceivable other grounds for pride and rejoicing!

But we observe a tendency to resentment toward the God of both the New and Old Testaments because His rules are so strict and because He requires absolute holiness before one is admitted to heaven—His royal palace and gardens. But would anyone want to have things changed in this regard, since He provides the absolute cleansing which makes us fit to enter and welcome; provides the only medium effective to "make the foulest clean," the blood from His own veins, and requires only that we allow Him to cleanse us and clothe us with the royal raiment of His imputed righteousness? Does anyone question a mother's love because she insists that her little son be utterly cleansed from filth—especially if she knows that there are fatal germs in the defilement? Are we not glad that the owners of Middleton and Magnolia Gardens do not allow trash and tin cans to mar the almost heavenly beauty of these foreglimpses of Paradise? Would we have our God and Father tolerate even a slight degree of defilement and defacement in that heaven which is to be our eternal home?

Our hearts are deeply moved when we read how lovable, hot hearted, greatly sinning, greatly repenting King David who, with his generous, gallant, chivalrous heart in spite of his sins, was a man after God's own heart (and what hopefulness there is in this intimation that, even like ourselves, God loves warm hearted, repentant sinners more than the coldly self-righteous!) cried after the death of his son Absalom: "Would God that I had died for thee, oh, Absalom, my son." But have our hearts burned within us as they should when we read in Genesis how our Creator, and through Christ the Heavenly Father of all born again ones, said a more moving thing than this to His sinning son Adam?

We read of his cry—in which any father can detect the heart-break—"Adam, where art thou?" and then at the close of that momentous, tragic interview we read the promise that our Father made: "I *am* going to die for thee, Adam my son," for in the light of Isaiah 53, the Gospels and Epistles and the whole subsequent Bible record, the promise of the Seed of the woman to crush Satan's head was the promise to come to earth in Per-

son to die on Calvary to regain for Adam and his posterity the Paradise he had then by his sin lost for himself and the whole human race.

DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY

The great doctrine of the Trinity will be one of those things easier to believe than to doubt for everyone who gives himself the inestimable benefit of reading Dr. Nathan R. Wood's great book, "The Secret of the Universe," one of the most profound books, a famous reader declared, ever written without inspiration.

As Dr. Wood points out, this is a triune universe of time, space and matter, the three great and only realities, each of which is itself triune. Time is made up of present, past and future; space of length, breadth and thickness (the "fourth dimension," time, being also dealt with by Dr. Wood with much greater clarity than by Einstein) and matter exists by virtue of power behind the electrons, motion and phenomena. How wonderful that the Bible revelation of deity—the first cause—should present a God triune in His nature even as is His creation! Moreover, we know that without three dimensions there is no objective reality at all—merely mental concepts, like a straight line, with only one dimension and no existence, a plane with two dimensions and still no reality, until we come to the cube with three dimensions and objective reality. A criticism of the Unitarians of Trinitarian doctrine is that one plus one plus one cannot help but be three, not One, whether this arithmetic is applied to God or apples; but when we remember that you do not add together the three dimensions of a body but multiply them upon each other, we see that our conception should be of One times One times One, making One, Father times Son times Holy Ghost, giving us the objectively and only real Triune God revealed to us in Jesus Christ. Reflection that about everything we can conceive of from a syllogism to a symphony has this inherent threeness, of which the second element is always the manifest part, as, for instance, the syllogism "All men are mortal," "John is a man," therefore "John is mortal," in which the second premise is the only vivid and visible element, and in a Beethoven symphony of the three

elements, the conception of the music in Beethoven's mind, then its audible rendition and finally the emotional reception of the music by the hearers, again only the second element in the Trinity is the object of our perception, gives us an inkling how profound is this Scriptural revelation of a triune Creator and Sustainer in which the Second Person, God the Son, the Logos, is the "brightness of God's glory and the express image of his person," to whom the Holy Spirit points every heart and eye of faith as the one through whom we worship and approach the blessed Trinity and each member thereof.

The whole church owes a debt of gratitude to Dr. Wood for suggesting and developing this profound line of thought.

PREDESTINATION

No Christian doctrine probably has given greater difficulty to believer and unbeliever than the clearly asserted one of predestination; yet consideration of the item of Webster's faith which he stated so clearly should make this thing "thinkable." "Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son." How illuminating is the consideration that Webster mentions "that things past, present and to come are all equally present in the mind of Deity"; for as surely as God knows the past and present, in common with His creatures, so the detailed fulfillment of prophecy shows He knows the minutest future events, many of which involved the actions of free agents, such as Judas' betrayal price for Jesus the Christ. So the moment when a sinner accepts Christ, though future by thousands of years as men think, is as present to God as the moment when the deed is accomplished and the sinner "lays hold on his covenant." But if there is no difficulty in conceiving of God ordaining to eternal life a man at the moment he accepts Christ's atonement, there is none connected with God's so ordaining to life those whom He knows will of their own free will accept His forgiving love from the "beginning" during which all things are eternally present.¹

¹ If this view is not entirely in accord with the "hyper Calvinism" which Charles G. Finney mentions as an obstacle in the minds of some lawyers with whom he dealt, it seems to be in accord anyway with Romans 8: 29; and free will is a thing created and allowed at such pain and cost to God and man that it seems too expensive a thing to be conceived of as utterly canceled and unexercised in this great matter. (Linton.)

I verily believe, after forty years of reflection on these things, that sufficiently careful study of the Bible, logic and philosophy will show the reasonable "rightness" of every Christian doctrine.

POLYGAMY

Before reaching the conclusion that everything a Christian is called upon to accept in the Bible is reasonable and right, many questions and problems roll around in a man's mind and are confided to him as obstacles to faith by others.

After a lecture at Wilson College some years ago one young lady said that the Lord's complacent attitude toward the polygamy of the patriarchs was impossible for her to reconcile with full faith in the Old Testament. Whether satisfactory to the young lady or not, the following line of thought has made it possible for this thing to rest comfortably in my mind among the other items of my belief.

First, that nothing is right or wrong except as it is according to the will and Word of God. There is no higher law or standard. Without realizing it, sometimes God is considered as a sort of "prosecuting attorney" to enforce compliance with certain standards by which He Himself is morally bound. Those who are at all familiar with Calvin's Institutes know the fallacy of this conception. As there would be empty nothingness except for Him who "upholds all things by the word of His power" (in which no moral law could operate) which power if withdrawn would cause the stars to black out, the electrons to stop whirling and the molecules, the material of which the universe is made, to disappear "and leave not a wrack behind," so God is the creator and sustainer of all moral standards. If He had seen fit to place Adam in the Garden of Eden with five mates—as is common among the lower creation—it would have been as inherently right as the making of one woman for one man. The Bible makes clear one woman for one man is His ideal and will for man, as He knows He has so constituted human hearts and emotions that there is the maximum of peace and happiness when there is one mate and no other—an ideal maintained even by the swans who mate for life. And to repeat the quotation from Matthew Henry, "It is easier

to be true to one wife than to a harem." However, when Abraham and David and others of God's " friends " had more than one wife in that ancient day, to whom, it is to be supposed, they were faithful and considerate and " good providers," there was no violation of any law and standard of " inherent rightness," no committing of a thing *malum per se*, as distinguished from a thing merely *malum prohibitum* (evil by nature as contrasted with wrong only because forbidden) such as would call for condign punishment by God and severing of His relationship with them—as promptly followed the inherently criminal act of David in taking Uriah's wife—so that unless we contend that God should have dealt only with perfect men, the departure of even the good men of those days (when a rapid increase of population was a basic policy approved by God) from God's ideal at the beginning, and its reaffirmation now in the form of a specific and inviolable commandment by Christ, we cannot find any inconsistency on God's part in the record of His dealing in this matter.

So He who " maketh the wrath of man to praise him " could, without violating even our poor, presumptuous ideas of what a God should do, bring about the deliverance of the Jews from Haman by giving Esther favor in the king's sight when she was involuntarily but possibly not disinterestedly a participant in the Persian beauty contest of long ago. If we just do not forget the absolute sovereignty of God, these difficulties are dissolved by this fact, and it will be found that God never sanctioned anything inherently contradictory to His holy perfection as it is revealed to us in the Bible.

" The Lord is righteous in his ways and holy in all his works." Psalm 145: 17.

UNDESERVED SUFFERING

An infidel pointed out the fact, utterly inconsistent he contended with a belief in God, that under his providence a man exposed to chill while rescuing a child from drowning was oftentimes allowed to die of pneumonia and another to suffer fatal burns in performing an heroic rescue from a house afire just as those may be who are injured or sickened in the performance of a crime. This is indeed " a great evil under the sun "

under the present (but thank God soon to end) reign of sin and death; but does our infidel complainer realize that if he could change this situation he would automatically destroy one of the most priceless things in human life—the very possibility of heroic and unselfish action? If a man knew in advance that in any dangerous thing the service of country or peril of another presented him a chance to undertake, the very fact that it was a worthy act he contemplated would automatically preserve him from all danger of suffering or injury, obviously at one stroke the heroic deeds which have thrilled and helped keep alive the divine fire in human hearts of bravery and devotion would be forever ended. Sacrificial mother love would be an impossible thing. No medal for gallantry would ever be pinned on a soldier's breast, while the heart of the hero, that of his general and comrades swelled with one of the divinest emotions this side of heaven.

The time is coming when "there will be no more pain," and no more crying or tears; but, as God has ordained matters, that blissful, unclouded eternity will be intensified in joy and glory as only preceding heroic endurance and gallantry and honorable battle scars can increase it. Surely for some presumptuous atheist to make a God according to his liking and to arrange the events of this life according to his notions would prove an even more difficult and disastrous thing than the struggle now going on to substitute statutory regulations for trade and human actions in place of the automatic order and balance previously supplied by the laws of nature and of supply and demand.

VIII

LAYING TWO GHOSTS

EVOLUTION AND THE HIGHER CRITICISM

THE "Sacred Cow of Evolution" and the "assured results of the Higher Criticism" should not be entirely neglected in any effort to set forth the exercises of mind by which a "third twin of doubting Thomas" came to believe and contend that these things should be completely canceled, leaving the "certainty of those things wherein "we have been instructed" unaffected by them. As surely as "men love darkness better than light"—like the bugs which scurry for cover when the light is flashed on at night—anything which might weaken the categorical imperative of the Bible's statements and commands and remove God far from a sinner unreconciled to Him by saving faith in the shed blood of His Son, is bound to be as welcome as a smoke screen to a pursued vessel. Except for the Bible-revealed warping of a man's mind and heart it would be hard to understand the readiness with which he will give up the high lineage the Bible tells him is his (though much addicted to hanging a coat of arms of some branch of his family in the library) and accept without qualm or question *Pithecanthropus Erectus* as an honored ancestor. Generally men prefer to be black sheep of a noble family to being worthy scions of a family of humble, peasant origin. Why then does he dislike the fact disclosed that his first grandfather was created in the image of God: that he started life in a palatial garden, with a mate of queenly beauty; that he was clothed in light so resplendent and effective as a warming and protecting envelope that no clothing was needed for such glowing beings, but that when Adam sinned and instantly lost contact with God "the light went out" (that light faint traces of which have been discovered still

to emanate from even organs of the human body) just as separation from the source of power leaves the black filament in a light bulb, which while incandescent is so radiant that it is itself invisible behind its glory, to appear in its stark nakedness?

If the answer is that it is not preference but proof which causes one to choose an ape rather than God for his progenitor, the rebuttal seems suggested that while it is hard to find a man who has not read the "case for evolution" it is just about impossible to find one who accepts it who has studied the case against it, as anyone can discover by such inquiries as I have made individually and of large audiences. God requires holiness and control of animal instincts, while evolution does neither, but invites that sensual indulgence which is as much easier than self-control and cultivation of a love for the spiritual and unseen as it is easier to roll down hill than to climb up—to "roll off a log" than to remain on it.

The evolutionist prefers to regard himself not as a disgrace to a kind Father but a great credit to a careless one—if one has to be bothered with any filial relationship at all, which is extremely doubtful—except when in a shell hole or floating on a rubber raft at sea. Is not this the reason?

Whatever the reason for the preference it is the proof that counts, and this proof of evolution is so lacking that in any court a "motion to direct a verdict" for lack of evidence putting its opponent to the necessity even of answering would be granted. The resolution duly made, seconded and passed in that New England convention of scientists some years ago to the effect that every scientist worthy of the name believed in evolution was almost as unscholarly an exhibition of prejudiced ignorance and blind attachment to an unsupported theory as Professor Bateson's appeal to his fellow evolutionists to join with him in reaffirming their faith in the theory in spite of the fact he had just admitted that a half century of effort had failed to disclose any evidence in support of it. That a world famous scientist should so disclose the evolutionists' "obscurantist" (a favorite adjective applied to orthodox Christians) devotion to a godless theory requires proof, and here are his words as spoken to the American Association for the Advancement of Science

December 28, 1911, in an address entitled "Evolutionary Faith and Modern Doubts."¹

"Discussions of evolution came to an end primarily because it was obvious that no progress was being made. . . . When students of other sciences ask us what is currently believed about the origin of species we have no clear answer to give. Faith has given place to agnosticism. . . . We cannot see how the differentiation into species came about. Variations of many kinds we daily witness, but no origin of species. . . . I have put before you very frankly the considerations which have made us agnostic as to the actual mode and processes of evolution. When such confessions are made the enemies of science see their chance. . . . Let us then proclaim in precise and unmistakable language that our faith in evolution is unshaken."

Suppose a Fundamentalist had called on fellow believers to proclaim that although science and archaeology had failed to bring to light a single thing in confirmation of faith in the Bible "let us proclaim in precise and unmistakable language that our faith in the Bible is unshaken!" What an illustration that would have afforded of ignorant devotion to an unproved superstition, disgracing all claims to be intelligent men guided by proof in forming conclusions! No wonder Professor Louis Trenchard Moore in commenting upon Bateson's statement in his great book "The Dogma of Evolution," printed by the Princeton and by the Oxford University Presses, says:

"Is it astonishing when a revolt occurs when the prop to our faith (in evolution) is thus knocked out? It cannot reassure us to have Professor Bateson tell us, at the close of his address, to be of good cheer because the mystery may be solved tomorrow; we cannot forget that, after sixty years of diligent search to clear this mystery of the origin of species and of the method of their variations, he confesses that not even a start has been made" ("Dogma of Evolution," p. 29).

In another part of this scholarly work Professor Moore advises evolutionists to abandon the search for proof of their theory and base their faith in it "frankly on the impregnable rock of superstition."

And at another place he says that of course "special creation"—what the Christian believes—explains every phenomenon

¹ "Science," Vol. LV, page 55.

and fact known, and that whether a man accepts this or the theory of evolution is merely a matter of temperament and preference. Since it is admitted that every fact known fits the theory of special creation and by evolutionists themselves that sixty years of search have failed to uncover the facts that fit evolution, it seems that there should be little difficulty in choosing between the theory and belief that every fact fits and the one that is supported by none!

Of course that duly passed resolution of the convention which declared it the sense or judgment of the convention that evolution was believed by every real scientist in the world canceled by a viva voce vote the attainments and scientific reputation of such men as Professor J. S. R. Agassiz, of Harvard, St. George Mivart, of University College, London, Sir William Thompson, better known as Lord Kelvin, Professor Albert G. P. Fleischmann, of the University of Erlangen, Professor Max Vundt, of Leipsic, Professor Virchow, of Berlin, Sir William Dawson, Geologist of McGill University, and his son Dr. Bell Dawson, Dr. Robert Etheridge, paleontologist of the British Museum, Sir Ambrose Fleming, President of the Victoria Institute and Philosophical Society of Great Britain, and many others; but so bred is a lawyer to regard lightly the opinion of any man except as it is supported by facts and logic, that the *ipse dixit* of all these men put together, whether for or against evolution, weighs less in my mind than such obvious facts as these:

That in the supposed struggle for existence any developing organ or variation is until perfected a fatal handicap instead of an advantage—a dangling, million-year-short-of-perfection-leg, developing bones, joints and sinews from an accidental wart on a swimming creature's belly and so slowing his swimming through the water—being a thing to cause its unfortunate owner to predecease rather than survive standard specimens; and so with a mole-like creature stretching into wings the skin between its legs by leaping after flying insects, and therefore unable to run as well as usual because its legs were half wings and unable to fly at all because its wings were still half legs;

That a struggle in time of drouth to reach high leafy boughs by creatures with ambition to become giraffes, so severe as to make a few inches extra length of neck sufficient to preserve

and segregate mates similarly blessed so as to promote breeding by them alone would eliminate all females whose necks are shorter than the males', leaving the task of producing posterity to the male sex alone;

That instead of the tens of thousands of intermediate forms which should fill in the gaps between the thousands of species the rocks preserved—from the 99 percent creature from which the variation started and 1 percent that toward which it tended, through every percentage short of 100 percent, we find not a single specimen of those so needed to give even color of plausibility to the theory by which fallen man seeks to relieve any sense of responsibility or admiration to God and transfer it to blind chance, which makes neither moral nor emotional demands upon its votaries;

The manifest inevitability of Darwin's failure to answer Fabre's challenge to account for that perfect instinct which enables a water spider to weave and air-inflate under water for its egg a balloon, and of the wasp that lays its egg at the tail end of a grub paralyzed by skilful surgical injections, by any possible application of the theory of evolution and conception of inherited memory and skill, which had to be perfect the first time if there was ever to be a second generation.

When we remember that just about everything confidently proclaimed by materialistic science from the corpuscular theory of light to the spontaneous generation of life has been proven wrong—though Pasteur was almost crucified by his fellow scientists for daring to dispute spontaneous generation which they all believed—we can be sure that no one need have his Christian faith sickened and nauseated by trying to make it digest this dismal and undigestible, God-dishonoring, science-repudiated theory, which the 1938 and last edition of the French Encyclopoedia (article by P. Lemoine) declared was manifestly impossible and not believed by real scientists any more.

HIGHER CRITICISM

As to the Higher Criticism which once "wrought such folly in Israel" the very odor of its dissolution is now growing faint, every fact upon which it ventured to try to support its "historical imagination"-created theories having been discovered to

be so humiliatingly contrary to what it was contended! The ruins of the Hittite empire which "never existed" were discovered; the Tel el Amarna tablets showed that if Moses didn't write the Pentateuch because he couldn't write he was probably the only man in Egypt (though learned in all the arts of the Egyptians) so limited. The Ras Shamra discoveries disclosed that there was an alphabet before Abraham and that of the index system by which "books" might be procured as wanted from the Babylonian public libraries, made as foolish the contentions as to the low state of literacy of the Bible patriarchs and their contemporaries as the art work in Tutankhamen's tomb and that even earlier one at Ur of the Chaldees did of their art.

That the Greek musical instruments mentioned in Daniel did not prove that his great prophetic book was written after some of the events in the Greek period became manifest when they were discovered represented in the ruins of Nebuchadnezzar's palace and it became known that they came to Greece from the orient by way of Babylon; and the contention of Dr. Driver that Cyrus, King of Persia, was an unnecessary and unusual way to refer to him, as in the book of Daniel except long after his death was shown to be purely a postprandial historical imagination discovery by Robert Dick Wilson's finding that Cyrus had never been designated otherwise by his contemporaries, whose mention of him in this way he found in numerous inscriptions and writings by many writers in several languages. The imagination is a much more comfortable implement to use than a spade but not nearly so trustworthy in the results attained.

The contempt with which courts of law hold such methods as the Higher Criticism felt sure diluted the categorical statements and commands of the Bible was shown in a trial in Canada where they were sought to be used in a case involving, as I recall it, plagiarism of some writings of H. G. Wells. The judge refused to allow even a few hours of the valuable time of the court to be spent on this thing to which many preachers had devoted their whole lives in producing polychrome versions of the Bible, showing just at which word one Isaiah stopped and another man by the same name began, and which part of Genesis came from what source and which from another be-

cause they had failed to note that different names for God, instead of being fortuitous and caused by various unknown writers using the one they fancied, were governed by the profound propriety of using Jehovah when God was mentioned in His relationship to man as the One who had made a covenant with him, and as Elohim when merely as the Creator of the universe.

IX

PERSUADING OTHERS

TWO LAWYERS EXAMINE THE BIBLE TOGETHER

EVEN while I was studying law I always had some book on the Evidences partly read, and a short while after I was admitted to the bar I had my first joyous experience in helping a brother lawyer to get first an intellectual conviction and then a spiritual experience of the truth and reality of Christ's religion.

This young lawyer remarked one morning that he had been glancing through a Bible the night before and wondered what to think about it. This gave me my opening, and from that day on for weeks we were both deep in the strongest works we could get for and against Christianity.

I gave him as the first book to read "Nelson on the Cause and Cure of Infidelity," and I remember how often it appeared on his desk when he should have been working on a brief. He was thoroughly convinced, I think, before he had finished the book; but following the suggestion of Nelson himself and my own example, he decided to make it impossible for the Devil, any unbeliever, or his own naturally doubting heart ever to say his faith existed only because he knew only one side, so he studied carefully the arguments for unbelief as presented by able infidels.

We got Ingersoll's Lectures from the public library, several works of Voltaire, Paine and others. We had some difficulty in getting works on the Evidences, but no trouble whatever in securing at the library luxurious editions of these infidel works. Ingersoll's Lectures now lay open on my friend's desk for many days at a time, and many times a day we would go

into some matter that Ingersoll brought forth with all his eloquent skill, and we never left it until my friend expressed himself as satisfied that his argument had been completely answered or removed. Some of these infidel arguments were discussed with our great associate in the law office, and it is a joy now to remember with what lawyer-like thoroughness they were answered or turned back against the enemy.

I recall a few of the difficulties or arguments against the belief that the Bible is God's infallible revelation which Ingersoll raised and over which my young lawyer friend and I labored.

One was Ingersoll's sarcastic comment on the death sentence in Leviticus upon any Israelite who profaned the holy oil used in anointing the high priests, a matter which he spoke of as a penalty for infringing Jehovah's patent on hair oil. My friend had little difficulty in conceding the right of a holy God to teach His people obedience, reverence, and the essential lesson that their God (and every detail connectd with His worship), in distinction from all the gods of the heathen, was of awful holiness and could be approached only after sacrificial cleansing.

The most impressive point Ingersoll made along this line was the passage in the Old Testament where a man is commanded, if his own son should say to him, "Let us go and serve other gods," to "stone him with stones, that he die." He asked whether he was to believe that God really commanded a father to kill his son if he proposed an act of idolatry.

As well as I can remember it, this is the line of reasoning and illustration which satisfied him. "Suppose in the early days of Rome, say, when she was fighting for her life against Hannibal—the son of some scarred centurion who had fought at Cannae came to him and said, 'Come, let us betray Rome to the Carthaginians,' and we had read that the stern patriot father had slain him on the spot, would we not even now share some of the iron approval which every Roman of that day would have bestowed upon that act? Now consider: Jehovah had led the children of Israel through the Red Sea, He had fed them manna in the wilderness, spared His people all the plagues surrounding them in Egypt, brought down the walls of Jericho at the blast of their trumpets, and nurtured them with all the tender care of a mother and the hopeful encouragement of a fa-

ther; and suppose a son who had heard and seen these things should then propose to his father, 'Come, let us betray Jehovah our God and offer our worship and allegiance to His enemy and ours,' is there anything incompatible with God's righteousness and justice and mercy, so necessary for the welfare of the Jewish people and all the nations of the earth who were to inherit from them alone a knowledge of the one true God, if He commanded such a deadly and far-reaching act to be punished by death, even though the parental relation had to be sacrificed to preserve the infinitely deeper sanctity of relationship between man and his God?" A consideration of the rigors of nature now that sin has thrown it into disorder, and of the high qualities of holy justice which the Bible explains are a part of God's character, as well as the tender love and mercy which those who reject the Bible arbitrarily alone attribute to Him, led us to see that this stern law was not inconceivably God's mandate for that stern day.

In reading Paine's "Age of Reason" we readily found the answer to the arguments based on the variant statements of the contents of the inscriptions on the cross, and the divergent genealogies of Jesus Christ, my friend's faith being strengthened as he faced the explanation that the genealogy of Matthew is that of Joseph, the putative, legal, adoptive father, through whom the Christ was a legal heir to David's throne, and Luke's the genealogy of Mary, through whom the very blood of David came down to him; the prophecy and command being thus fulfilled that no man of the seed of Jeconiah, Joseph's remote ancestor, should ever sit on the throne of David, to which throne the Messiah is the rightful and eternal heir.

Voltaire's sarcasm was so largely directed against the abuses of the Catholic Church, and was to so great an extent answered in Nelson's work, that he made but slight impression.

A great light was shed on the doctrine and fact of the atonement by that great Scottish lawyer and theological writer of the nineteenth century, Thomas Erskine, which made the atonement appear to my friend not as a cruel, vindictive, and unreasonable thing, such as the Arian sects regard it, but as something so profoundly necessary, and at the same time supernaturally

and impossibly presumptuous if thought of as a mere human conception, that it demands a divine origin.

In Erskine's "Internal Evidences" an illustration is given from ancient Greek history which is a complete and unanswerable argument for the thrice blessed central fact of our faith, the blood atonement.

Zaleucis, king of the Locrians, in order to stamp out immorality in his kingdom, passed a stern law that all guilty of a certain offense should from that time have both eyes put out.

Among the first offenders brought before him was his own son.

He was a father, and loved his son; he was a king, and loved and must do justice. How could he vindicate his law and righteousness as a just judge and king, and at the same time prove his love for his son and spare him from lifelong darkness? If he were only a father he could forgive and forget; if he were only a king he could inflict and forget.

The king solved the problem in this way: he had one of his son's eyes put out, and one of his own. Thereafter, whenever a subject looked at his king on the throne, he would see his eyeless socket and say in his heart, "How great the king's love that led him to give one of his own eyes to spare his son from total blindness; and how great and sacred the king's law and justice, whose just penalty is inflicted even though the offender be the crown prince himself and the suffering is borne by both prince and king." The king thus perfectly, at great cost to himself, vindicated and established both his love and his law.

As Erskine points out, our King Jehovah solved His problem, when Adam His son fell, even more wonderfully. If Zaleucis had put out both his own eyes and let his son go untouched he would have approached more nearly what our Father and our King did to vindicate and sustain His love and His justice; for He took the whole penalty on Himself in the person of His Son, His other self, and lets us guilty sinners go scatheless, on the sole condition that we "trust in His redeeming blood" and are thankful. "He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."¹

¹ II Corinthians 5: 21.

As Erskine further points out, this very doctrine is a powerful argument for the deity of Christ, in this way: that if Christ were not "very God of very God" the whole plan of redemption would be open to the objection that God spares one man and exacts His vengeance on another man—which falls utterly flat when the other "man" is the "God Man," God incarnate in human form, who Himself "bare our sins in his own body on the tree."

We shall not see our King sightless on the throne of the universe, but there is good reason to believe that all through eternity our hearts will burn whenever our eyes rest upon His blessed person and note the great scars (for the nails must almost have torn the palms of our blessed Redeemer's hands to pieces) in His hands and feet—the wounds suffered in saving us.

An illustration of the Bible's supernatural freedom from the flaws and inconsistencies inevitable in the most gifted and carefully written natural book had weight with my lawyer friend, as Thomas Erskine pointed out the divine appropriateness of the facts and doctrines of the Scripture to produce the character presented as its goal.

He illustrated it by the Koran, wherein, as a reward and an inducement to abstain from forbidden things—he mentions drunkenness and adultery—the obedient follower of the Prophet is promised a sensual paradise where lust and the joys of intoxication will be indulged to an unlimited and superhuman degree. Now there is an obvious hitch and failure of the facts, doctrines, and understanding of psychology in the Koran and an inappropriateness to produce the results of chastity and temperance desired, for the inducement to abstinence is contemplation of the reward for refraining, and this reward is of such nature that its contemplation will necessarily inflame the present desire, so that the thing works backwards, and thus a most palpable blunder and suggestion of human origin for the Koran appears.

In the Bible, on the other hand, we have none of the inflaming details of the Koran as to the state of the blest hereafter. Christ's own reticence and refusal to give stimulating details of the joys of Paradise free Him forever from any possibility of

being charged with being an excited fanatic (religious "enthusiasm," or fanaticism, being a favorite bugaboo with the agnostics attacking Christianity in the eighteenth century) and resorting to this invariable human device for arousing the zeal of religious followers; yet there is just enough said to stir the heart with longing for "the land that is very far off" without heating the mind and distracting from practical service in this life. It is made clear that we have substantial bodies, like our Lord's glorious resurrection body, which had "flesh and bones" (the earth had drunk his blood), could eat and drink (and how perfectly this sociable, distinctly human act of eating before His disciples was adapted to assure them of the resurrected and glorified but human corporeity of their dear dead and returned Leader), was not subject to the law of gravity (any more than gold is to the pull of the magnet), and could interpenetrate matter in its ordinary form (a thing easy to conceive now that we have discovered the real unsubstantiality of the electrons and the substances which they make up). We learn that at God's right hand there are pleasures for evermore, utter peace and contentment for the "divine discontent which is the price of immortality" in this life, and beauty such as has never entered into the heart of man to conceive; but all is presented in such a way as to rest and calm the mind and quiet all the tumultuous passions of the heart. So here again my friend and I agreed that we had a bit more of the cumulative evidence of divine skill and care in wording the Book.

Nothing I can remember had a more inescapable effect on his mind than the direct historical testimony for the bodily resurrection of the Lord Jesus from the dead. With three horns of a trilemma to choose from: either that the evangelists and eye-witnesses of His alleged resurrection were telling a lie they knew was a lie, or were telling a lie they believed was true as sincerely deluded men, or were telling the truth—he declared there was absolutely no mental rest but in the third.

Knowing from the inspired record as well as from profane history (for instance, the well-known extracts from Pliny's letter) of the persecution, torture, and death inflicted on practically all who persisted in declaring that "one Jesus which was dead is alive," my lawyer friend found it unthinkable that

these men should lie about this thing, knowing they were lying, when all they got was death here, and, under any assumption, either annihilation or eternal punishment after death. While many men have lied to escape the cross, gallows or stake, since the world began no man has ever lied for the sole reward of dying in torment.

But with the absolute sincerity of the witnesses thus established by voluntary martyrdom, the highest conceivable proof, and this demonstrated sincerity being with regard, not to an abstraction, theory or opinion where conscientious error may exist, but to the most unmistakable possible matter of fact, the difference between life and action on one hand and death and sense-attested decay on the other, my friend was constrained to admit that Christ's bodily resurrection was supported by evidence which it was inconceivable could mislead, provided the Gospels were true records of the testimony in the case.

With the authenticity and age of the Gospels established as they are by the voluminous and almost contemporaneous citations from them heretofore mentioned, my friend agreed that this one line of proof should really so overwhelm any rational mind with conviction of the truth of everything established by the fact of Christ's resurrection (and this includes the whole Fundamentalist Evangelical position about the Bible and its Christ) that doubt should never arise again.¹

¹ See Greenleaf's "Testimony of the Evangelists" as to admissibility of the Gospels as properly authenticated ancient documents according to strict legal rules.

X

PERSUADING OTHERS (CONTINUED)

AMONG the speculative things my young lawyer friend and I considered were the existence of a rational first cause, the personality of God, and the love of God.

At the present time it would be difficult to find any notable scientist or philosopher, however far they may be from being Christians, who do not attribute at least mathematical and architectural powers to the First Cause. Sir James Jeans or Eddington speaks of "the great architect," Einstein of the "pure mathematician" and a dozen others whose views I have recently studied seem to agree that behind the universe is a knowledge of mathematics, chemistry, physics; and to my mind it is an easy and inevitable thing to believe that He who knows mathematics, chemistry, physics can also read and write, to express it this way, and is a Person. But a man once said to me that his God or conception of the First Cause was too great to be a person, to which it was objected that if to the most "infinite" possible conception of God is added the plus qualities or quantities of intellect, feeling and will, constituting personality, we have a larger, fuller conception than without them, so that a personal God is, as Flint contends in his *Anti-Theistic Theories*, the very greatest and highest God conceivable.

EVIDENCES OF DESIGN

A study of Flint's "Theism" and Paley's "Natural Theology" saturated my friend's mind, like mine, with a conviction that the existence of that wonderful camera the eye, the wonderful harp in the ear, with its connected spirit level with which to secure perpendicularity in two planes, the check valves in the veins, the elastic band balancing a lion's heavy head, the mental and physical adaptation of man to woman and woman to

man—"like bow to arrow" as Paley says—proved that back of the universe was a wonderful designer and artificer who secured mechanical results in a workmanlike way which gave us a humble sense of finite kinship as we studied the physical problems solved. I am irresistibly tempted at this point to quote one paragraph from Paley's *Natural Theology*, and I copy the very first paragraph on which my eye happened to fall when I opened the book for the purpose.¹

"In order to keep the eye moist and clean (which qualities are necessary to its brightness and its use), a wash is constantly supplied by a secretion for the purpose; and the superfluous brine is conveyed to the nose through a perforation in the bone as large as a goose-quill; or, more properly speaking, along two capillary tubes, one from either eyelid, which enter a duct, lodged in a canal passing through the bone. When once the fluid has entered the nose, it spreads itself upon the inside of the nostril, and is evaporated by the current of warm air which, in the course of respiration, is continually passing over it. Can any pipe or outlet for carrying off the waste liquor from a dye-house or a distillery be more mechanical than this is? It is easily perceived that the eye must want moisture; but could the want of the eye generate the gland which produces the tear, or bore the hole by which it is discharged—a hole through a bone?"

Let the atheist or the evolutionist tell us who bored the hole in the bone and laid a water pipe through it! And let the biology professor smile at Paley if he can.

At one time or another, when one starts to thinking about the marvels of the human frame, different physical devices seem most impressively to testify of a skilful artificer creator. The fact that the humerus is joined to a forearm with two bones, instead of one, with the result that the rolling motion of the wrist makes it possible for Kreisler to play the violin and all of us to do the things we could not do without this arrangement, has seemed to me invincibly to call for a planning creator. At the present moment I am most deeply impressed by the fact that God provided us with a range finder—without which highly developed device war ships could not direct their guns—by giving us not one Cyclopean eye but two spaced apart on a horizontal line, with the result that everyone feeling the degree

¹ Page 47.

of these adjacent angles with which he views an object has a range finder by which is produced the stereoscope-like vividness of the things we see, with their nearness and distance and relative position to other objects revealed in a way that those with only one eye lack. While there are to be seen on frosty mornings many men with such a pathetic faith in the evolutionary postulate expressed in the words about the eye that "sight was needed so an eye came out to meet the need" that they walk the streets with snow on their hairless scalps to notify nature how badly in their predicament hair is needed, would any of even these hopeful fellow "baldheads" go so far as to believe that a range finder was needed, so two eyes properly located and spaced on a horizontal line were the automatic response to that need?

An evidence of design in the realm of thought as complete as that recently revealed by the unveiling of the marble columned perfection of the Jefferson Memorial into which the former chaos of strangely curved stones has been built, is the divine perfection of the plan of redemption suddenly unveiled, like a perfected temple, when the angel on the signal "It is finished" from nearby Calvary rent the six-inch thick curtain hiding the Holy of holies! Then all men could see the purpose and place of the bewildering prophetic stones which seemed so strangely ill-fitted to make a coherent whole that the wisest students of the oracle of God could not conceive how they could be used, and discarded the very "chief of the corner" as utterly useless. Lacking the clew supplied after Christ died; "He hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin that we might be made the righteousness of God in him," how could any man conceive the building into a structure of divine beauty such bewildering, mutually canceling elements as that the coming One should "be despised and rejected" and yet be "the desire of all nations"; that He "should live forever" and yet be "cut off by an unjust judgment"; that He should be the "Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace" and yet valued at "thirty pieces of silver" and scourged and crucified; that though He was to be of David's royal line, He actually was born, true to prophecy, in Bethlehem, though that was not His parents' place of residence, in a cattle shed; that though He "did no violence neither was

deceit found in his mouth " He was to be numbered with the transgressors and though numbered with them buried in the rich man's tomb? Since Peter's sermon at Pentecost rang with such terrific force that it is echoing to this day all is clear and a wayfaring man though a fool can understand that " Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to him that believeth " and how it is that " If we confess with our mouth Jesus as Lord and believe in our hearts God raised him from the dead " we are saved by this allegiance to and trust in our self-sacrificing God; but that these discordant, chaotic, bewildering prophetic stones should fit together without divine plan is more irrational to believe than that the Jefferson Memorial is composed of accidentally matching parts of curving walls and columns.

PERSONALITY OF GOD

The personality of God seemed to my friend more reasonable to believe than to disbelieve, even aside from revelation, as we considered, among other things, a short syllogistic argument.

Man is an effect. Every cause must have in itself in some form all that is found in the effect, else something would come from nothing, and *ex nihilo nihil fit* (" from nothing, nothing is made "). Man finds in himself intellect, feeling, and will—the three elements and earmarks of personality; therefore God, our source and first cause, must have at least these qualities, in however greatly magnified and infinite form; and so God, thinking, feeling, willing, is a person, and we are not orphans lost in space.

DOES GOD LOVE US?

But does this Person love us? If He hated us and desired our suffering He could give us infinitely more pain than we do suffer. He could force us to eat, as the drug addict is forced to the use of his drug, by the pain of abstention instead of by the pleasing urge of healthy hunger. All physical functions could be forced by pain instead of invited by pleasure. If God were indifferent, why the variety of fruit flavors for the palate, the invariably harmonizing riot of colors in flower and sunset, the tang of salt air and power to vibrate in joy to these things, why the subtle joys and utter sense of well-being that a believer in

Christ often experiences which he cannot even name or describe? If God loves His creatures all is explained, except death, pain, and sorrow, and these things would indeed present, as they do present to all but believers, an insoluble problem. But the Bible's explanation is as clear as crystal. "Death (came) by sin," and the glorious end is as succinctly put as the explanation, "And God shall wipe all tears from their eyes."

ORIGIN OF EVIL

But my friend proposed the age-long question as to the first source of evil in a universe in which the first cause is an utterly good, holy and loving God, and the answer that satisfied him was that without free will God would have only the society of automata, with whom He could no more have fellowship than a shipwrecked mariner on a desert island could find companionship in a mechanical man he might construct ingeniously enough to walk and talk. Now a necessary corollary of free will, or agency, is the power to disobey as well as obey, so that it is the act of a perfectly free agent abusing a divine and good gift that first introduced rebellion and sin against the all-pervading law regulating the universe, and that necessarily produced suffering among the sensitive creatures affected by such disorder. But, foreknowing the rebellion of Satan, why did God create the universe at all, or Satan at all? The answer which seemed to satisfy us then—even aside from the proper childlike abandonment of all such questions to our God—was that just as a high and heroic character resulting from adversity and endured hardship is by the consensus of all men ample compensation for all that must be endured to produce it, so the enrichment of eternity by the existence of the glorified beings who "through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God" will a thousandfold compensate for the travail of man and God that was involved. "Ill fortune well borne is good fortune." (Marcus Aurelius, often quoted by Robert E. Lee.)

MAN'S INSIGNIFICANCE

A line of argument then considered and often presented to me as proving the Christian revelation impossibly improbable—and one that used to test my own faith—is expressed by David when he says: "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy

fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him?"¹ The agnostic generally expresses the idea by comparing mankind to mites burrowing in a cheese or animalculae spawned in a swamp, and sneers at the idea that the First Cause, even if it were a conscious, rational cause, would give a thought, much less a Son, to such a speck of star dust as the earth, to say nothing of the atoms of human life on this speck.

The great Scotch preacher, Thomas Chalmers, dealt with this subject in his "Astronomical Discourses," at a time when the then recently improved telescope opened up some of the infinite vistas through the stellar universe. He used the microscope as the antidote to the doubt based on the telescope. If the latter showed the infinite extent of God's creation, the former showed such exquisite skill and workmanship on almost invisible insects as to prove His infinite care for and attention to detail, and showed that "the God of the infinite was also the God of the infinitesimal"; that He who placed Saturn's rings put gemlike colors on a bug's wing and heard a faithful servant's petition for a suitable hat to wear at a missionary gathering.²

AN ILLUSTRATION OF GOD'S PERSONAL CARE

A few years after first writing the preceding sentence I had the pleasure of being fellow guests with Dr. and Mrs. Jonathan Goforth at a convention at Buffalo, New York. Dr. Goforth, whose name sounds as if he were a character in "Pilgrim's Progress," whose fame is surpassed by few missionaries who have gone to China and whose physiognomy reminded me of General Robert E. Lee and had stamped upon it the very likeness of a truth-speaking child of God, told me one evening after a meeting that as he, in his blindness, had one time pitched far forward in the beginning of a possibly fatal plunge down a steep stairway on a Chinese steamboat, a strong hand had pressed against his breast and forced him safely to an upright position. Mrs. Goforth, whose sight was perfect, was there at the time, saw the thing done though the angelic doer was in-

¹ Psalm 8.

² "How I Know God Answers Prayer," by Mrs. Rosalind Goforth.

visible and told me that what Dr. Goforth declared was true and verified by her own eyes though there was no human being there to do it. Who can doubt the truth of this statement or fail to thrill to the assurance it gives that indeed angels are "ministering spirits sent forth to minister to those who are the heirs of salvation," and how much more wonderful and delightful than the most wonderful fairy story of our childhood is our Christian religion if accepted and believed with all our hearts!

Certainly I cannot refuse my credence to this story, for with my own boyish eyes I saw my father have a similar experience. With a big basket of wash he was taking from our suburban home at "Forest Glen" near Washington, on his right arm, to be laundered in town, he ran for a train, missed the front rail by the car steps and caught the rear one, the result being that he swung between the cars (which then had no vestibules as at present). He had no leverage or purchase with which to swing himself around to the steps again, but he did suddenly swing from his perilous position to one of safety as he went up the steps. My father that evening told us that an arm had gone around his shoulders and swung him back to the steps, against the resisting momentum of the accelerating train. We have all heard of such things. I heard of the one from the man involved and saw the other. "Oh, fools and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken"; and how confidently we should commit ourselves and our loved ones in these perilous days to the keeping of God who will indeed give His angels charge over us and them until the appointed time to go home. The Bible tells us we have guardian angels; two men of the highest veracity told me they had by physical contact with them been lifted to safety against the force of gravity, and yet how little we have of that godly thrill which would be ours did we emotionally as well as intellectually believe this!

These dear angelic friends of ours have strict orders, evidently, not to reveal themselves to our bodily senses except in cases of absolute necessity, lest the exercise of patience and faith and courage in these earthly training days be interfered with; but as surely as we can trust God's Word and the unequivocal testimony of veracious men, they are there. And they excel in power. Gabriel struck Zacharias dumb when he

questioned the reliability of the message he brought to him of the son to be born, and that angel whom God sent to deal with Sennacherib's host laid the enemies of Israel out in windrows.

As Byron tells of it:

The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold,
His cohorts were gleaming in purple and gold,
And the gleam of his spears was like the stars on the sea
When the blue wave rolls nightly o'er deep Galilee.

* * * * *

But the Angel of Death spread his wings on the blast
And breathed in the face of the foe as he passed,
And the eyes of the sleepers grew deadly and chill
And their hearts heaved but once and forever grew still.

* * * * *

And the widows of Asshur are loud in their wail,
And the idols are broke in the temple of Baal,
And the might of the Gentile unsmote by the sword
Has melted like snow in the glance of the Lord.

May we as a nation so believe and so repent and pray to the Almighty that He may send His mighty angels to help us put down the cruel heathen and pagans who have taken peace from the earth! Gabriel or Michael could do it single-handed if the God of battles gave the order, and He is waiting to be gracious to those who humble themselves to seek Him as an ally. He who long ago instructed one of His little fish to take Peter the tax money he needed and one of His many seagulls to sacrifice itself to feed Captain Rickenbacker and his friends, can as easily send an earthquake or a typhoon against our present enemies as He sent that gale that saved England from the Spanish Armada and as He saved the men of Dunkirk from the waves of the British Channel, which He ordained should ordinarily be very turbulent, apparently to supplement the Channel's narrowness as a protecting barrier for England.

I have sometimes reasoned with an unbelieving friend who held it incredible—as did the late Walter Brisbane—that God gives individual care to anything so small and insignificant as a man, by asking if his argument was not in short as follows: Man is so small, he lives so short a time, and any person is lost

in such a host of other human beings, that it is unthinkable that God can care for or regard him as an individual.

This being the substance of the argument, I have suggested: Suppose a man, instead of being only six feet high, were six hundred feet high; suppose instead of living seventy years he lived seven thousand; and suppose instead of being one of a billion men the human race consisted of only a few dozen. Would the increase of physical bulk a hundred or a thousand-fold increase his spiritual value or even his material size or importance in a physical universe of infinite extent? Six feet is to infinity the same as six thousand feet. Such a change would merely result in dwarfing the relative size of man's habitat, unless it were increased in proportion, in which case we should be just where we were before. If his span of life were measured in centuries instead of months, how would this increase the time-importance of his life as compared to the eternity with which we have to do? And, lastly, what father having ten children and finding that his love for each of the ten is as great as that he had for his first and only son can rationally question the ability of the infinite Father to love each of His millions of children as much as if He had only a dozen?

"My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."¹ More than once it has been admitted that an argument based on such matters as are mentioned above rests on the very anthropomorphism which infidels affect to despise in Christians, and that, whatever a man's unintelligent feelings might be, there is no logical basis for disputing the comforting word of Scripture: "Even the very hairs of your head are all numbered," and "(a sparrow) shall not fall on the ground without your Father."²

Finally, after volumes had been considered, my friend came to the point of saying: ". . . we have found the answer to every single objection that Ingersoll, Tom Paine, and Voltaire have raised to a belief in the Bible. They haven't answered a single

¹ Isaiah 55: 8, 9.

² Luke 12: 7; Matthew 10: 29.

one of the arguments for it. I believe it is true. What must a man do to get saved?"

I told him to go to his knees that night and ask God to save him for Christ's sake; to confess all the sins he could remember, as a help to realizing how badly he needed a Saviour, and to keep on asking until God answered. God answered his first call.

The very next morning he came into my room as soon as I got to the office and said with a face that fairly glowed: ". . . I was born again last night. I know what that means now. It is as real a thing as being born the first time." He expressed his joy and exultation over and over again. He wanted forthwith to make a public confession of his faith, and we went that same day to the home of Dr. Wallace Radcliffe in Washington—to whom I later introduced another man in the same state of mind because I knew in his church his faith would be nurtured by sound, strong meat of sermons based on a full faith in God's Covenant and Word—and told him what we had come for. Dr. Radcliffe showed some of the joy that every Christian, pastor or layman, feels bubble up in his heart in answer to the joyous clamors of heaven itself when a new son is born into God's family, and proceeded to examine my friend with good, old-fashioned thoroughness. There was no uncertainty about my friend's belief and the goodness or nature of the grounds of his hope, and at the next communion Sunday he made the public confession which, under the covenant, assures him royal recognition before the angels at the high court of heaven.

He entered at once most actively into the life of the church, and carried himself as a "soldier of the cross" with the joyous boldness that an uncle of mine said was such a thrilling thing to observe in Jeb Stuart in battle—the debonair confidence and intrepidity which it is the joy of every earthly king to see his knights display, and which the Prince Immanuel, we believe, loves to see in the soldiers. He is waiting to crown and reward with the "white stone" mentioned in Revelation, on which is written the name of endearment known only to the Christian and his God. And this "holy boldness" can best, if not only, be known by one who has taken the trouble to learn and know

that he is able at any time to give "a reason of the hope" that is in him.

One of his first acts was to write to his fiancée of his new-found joy, and urge upon her an abandonment of everything of a worldly nature which could possibly act as a hindrance to the full enjoyment of Christ's blessing and fellowship. The young lady felt that giving up dancing and card playing and the theater was unnecessary, extreme, and fanatical, but this young lawyer replied that the thrilling joy and power that came from contact with Christ, in no wise insulated by unsundered worldliness, made such things so "dull, stale, flat, and unprofitable" as to have no charm for him whatever. They married later, and the wife's faith was soon kindled by the fire blazing in the heart of her husband. When I last heard from my friend he was president of the Bar Association of Seattle, Washington.

XI

MEN WHO WERE CONVINCED

THE experience of my young lawyer friend verified the truth of a statement Dr. Nelson makes in his book on Infidelity, that there are two cures for infidelity, one powerful, the other all-powerful. The first is to study, investigate, "prove all things, hold fast that which is good." But the infallible and all-powerful remedy is to "taste and see that the Lord is good," to call upon Him sincerely.

If you call a person and he answers by words, merely producing vibrations in the air, or in some other way, such as producing a humanly impossible result or change in circumstances or in your own heart, you know for a certainty that the person is alive and there to answer. Even if he does not answer, it is not proved that he is not there; but if he does answer, he is most certainly in being and in calling distance. William Biggs tried the all-powerful remedy.

A SAVED DRUNKARD

About thirty years ago he came into my office asking for a quarter with which to assuage the thirst for liquor which was then, and for twenty-five years or more had been, burning uncontrollably in his veins. His breath announced the business on which he had come as soon as he entered the room—a coming request casting its shadow before, so to speak.

He was invited to sit down and tell his troubles, and was told that there was infinitely more to be had for asking the right Man for help than he could get from me; that any money I would give him would merely push him a little closer to the brink of death and eternal despair, but that there was One who, if asked, could save to the "uttermost," as He had proved again and again and as I knew from my own personal experience.

Almost instantly the man responded to a suggestion that we go to our knees, since the One I referred to was not only a Man but a King also, even Jesus Christ our Lord. I recall asking our God to save this man who had come in desperation to Him for help, even as He had saved me; I told God that I had taken it upon myself, pursuant to the authority I understood He had vested in all believers, to assure this poor man that God would not refuse to answer even our prayers when offered in the name of Jesus Christ. I got William Biggs to pray for himself after me. As well as I can remember, I felt then no emotional impulse of faith in this my first effort to lead a drunkard to Christ, but I was moved by the determination to act in logical conformity with my absolute conviction that the Christ of the Bible was real and had ordered the thing done. I was utterly unprepared for the instantaneous, supernatural, and permanent result which followed, for manifestly William Biggs was ordained unto eternal life and God had given him faith to be saved.

He rose with "the water in his eyes," to use Bunyan's quaint phrase, and told me that he was conscious that he had been saved. He was not a talkative man, and we had few more words together at that time; but I saw him every few weeks until his death nearly twenty years after that moment in the little law office opposite the courthouse.

He came into the office a few weeks later, a neatly dressed and obvious gentleman, of the good lineage that was his. He said he had forgotten what the thirst for liquor was, and had not touched it or wanted it since he asked Jesus Christ to deliver him from it. Some months later he told of the efforts of some of his old drinking friends to drag him into the slough in which they still floundered—an experience similar to that of one of the men sketched in Harold Begbie's great book, "Twice-Born Men."

I saw William Biggs many times each year after his conversion, and have introduced him often to clients in my office as a living miracle of grace whose reality they could test by talking with the miracle, though the thing which happened has happened so often, as all of us who have ever engaged in rescue mission work know, that it almost seems more customary than miraculous. He never thirsted after that day long ago. He is now dead, but there is more to his story and I will tell later of

the unusual way he was housed and fed from day to day, until the Lord, who opened his eyes and turned him from darkness unto light and from the power of Satan unto God and gave him forgiveness of sins, called him to receive "livry of seisen" and actual enjoyment of the "inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in" Christ—that estate to which he already had the title deeds, signed, sealed, and delivered, in the faith that he had in his heart.

A CONVINCED SKEPTIC

Many years ago I was the guest of a young bond broker who took me on the steamer from Washington to Norfolk to inspect some property that was security for bonds his house had to sell. He is an ex-artillery captain of the First World War, scion of a fine old Virginia family, with one of the historic old "great houses" of Virginia as his home. He went to that school which has turned out so many famous men besides Phillips Brooks—the Alexandria Academy—and had, I think, believed in a way in Christianity all his life, though apparently he had never made a public confession of his faith.

Instead of going to our staterooms that night on the steamer, we got to discussing the great matters of the reality of the Christian religion, of the claims of the Bible, and the deity and bodily resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We sat up until after two o'clock, and during that time we considered many of the things that have given the color and solidity of reality to the Bible to all who have studied them. We recalled the discoveries of Sir William Ramsay and his verification of the most minute and disputed statements of Luke's writings; the utter overthrow by archaeology of the "assured results" of the higher criticism as to that late authorship of Daniel, the non-existence of Belshazzar, and of the Hittite Empire, and many other disputed and now so thoroughly established statements of the Bible; the Egyptian words embedded in the Pentateuch and manifold evidences that it was written, not after the Exile, but before even the institution of temple worship and the use of sacred music; the evidences that the books attributed to Luke were written by a doctor who knew the medical name for the blindness that afflicted Bartimaeus and

the technical name of the kind of needle Greek surgeons used, when referring to the metaphor about the camel and the needle's eye, and that John's Gospel was written by a fisherman who used the particular name of the kind of little fish the boy contributed to the feeding of the five thousand, and all the Gospels by men who lived at the time and in the places about which they wrote; the invincible proof presented by the detailed fulfillment of even a fraction of the prophecies of the Bible, notably those about the preservation from the time of trial that should come upon the world of "Philadelphia alone, far from the sea and forgotten by the emperor,"¹ from the Mohammedan scourge, and the destruction of the temple contrary to the specific command of Titus and the failure of the effort to rebuild it in spite of the best endeavor of the Emperor Julian—both according to Christ's prophecy—which seemed to arouse the astonishment of even the infidel historian Gibbon. The young broker's early faith had been watered down and compromised and emasculated by the attacks of the higher criticism, and these things were specially calculated to restore or create a belief in the supernatural accuracy of the Bible and the character of the Lord Jesus.

As soon as we got back to Washington, my friend went to see Dr. Wallace Radcliffe, at my suggestion, and told him of his desire to make a public confession of his faith in Christ in his church. This he did. He is now President of the Washington Stock Exchange and one of the most highly regarded men in the National Capital.

This case has an interest as showing the stimulating effect of concrete reasons for the faith that was already in him, that faith being set in motion in a mind already passively accepting but ready to surrender and compromise some of its claims under the assault of Modernism. With my own experience, and the similar experience of this man before me, my impression is strong that much of the lukewarmness and readiness to compromise on the part of Christians, and their indifference to the high call of personal evangelism, would be stirred into a warmer hue of resolution by a study and consideration of the great proofs of the truth and reality of our Gospel.

¹ Gibbon, "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire."

JEWISH EVANGELIZATION

The logical, historical and the self-evidencing internal proofs of the truth of Christianity are so indisputable that I have found them to arrest the surprised attention of just about every man to whom I have presented them, Jews even more than Gentiles seeming to be instantly arrested. A Jewish lawyer came all the way from Baltimore once to talk with me about matters set forth in a tract I sent him in the course of correspondence about a business matter we were handling. The tract was "Roger's Reasons No. 2." A few weeks ago a pleasant conversation developed with a gentleman who shared a railroad seat with me as I was returning from a directors' meeting of the American Board of Missions to Jews, in Brooklyn. As it turned out, that I was on Jewish missionary business seemed especially appropriate to this meeting, for it soon developed that my seat mate, whose culture and orotund manner of speaking I noted, was the rabbi of a Jewish synagogue in North Philadelphia.

Learning that I was a lawyer, the rabbi listened with the most courteous attention to the reasons why a man of my profession took so seriously his own Old Testament prophets and believed so firmly in the historic truthfulness of the Jewish New Testament account of the Jewish but divine Redeemer therein presented to us.

As we talked the thought flashed through my mind what a remarkable situation then and there existed, where a Gentile lawyer was trying to lead a Jewish rabbi back to faith in the religion his own race—the most prejudiced and bigoted in the world—had given as the one universal faith to the world, and how manifestly it must have required just such an "act of God" and vision as Peter records to induce him and the other dear Jewish brethren of long ago to count suffering and martyrdom a small price to pay for sharing with Gentiles the spiritual privileges which they had counted their exclusive ground of superiority over the great Gentile nations—the "jackals of Rome who in turn called them dogs of Jews." Jonah was so afraid that God's mercy might be extended to Nineveh if he preached to it that he ran away to sea and had to spend three chastening days traveling about with a whale before he came to feel that there was something worse even than seeing a

Gentile city not destroyed. St. Paul in writing to the Thessalonians (I Thess. 2: 14 et seq.) excoriates his own countrymen more stringently in some ways than it has ever been done since:

" . . . for ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they have of the Jews; who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved."

And yet it was from men of this race and kind that we Gentiles received the good news that founded Christianity amongst us, given to us at the cost of martyrdom and death of the very Jews that first proclaimed it. "Can a clean thing come out of an unclean" or self-sacrificing love flow without a miracle from hearts filled with bitter hatred? And in the very Gospels written by Jews we find the Jewish Messiah there presented so utterly free from racial prejudice that He never even calls Himself the Son of Abraham or David, as all around Him did, but the "Son of Man"—the Son of the human race. What made these early Jews glad to die if only they could share their exclusive spiritual privileges with despised Gentiles, and such Jewish men as Bishop Schereschewsky in our day exhaust his life in giving in their own tongue the Gospel even to far-away "heathen Chinese"? Is not the hand of God manifest in this thing? Is not the answer that the "new birth" is such a reality that the most prejudiced and bitter man's very nature is changed and all lines of distinction between men and races are swallowed up in the great, eternal relationship established by birth into God's family and household? "Hereby we know we are passed from death unto life, if we love the brethren."

When we reached Philadelphia my rabbi acquaintance wrote down my name, gave me his card and promised to accept my luncheon invitation the next time he was in Washington. My heart was still warm from this evidence of the wonderful "case" the Lord has given us to present, with such proofs that no rational man can be unaffected by them, when a young army officer sitting in the seat in front of us got up to leave the train and turned to me and extended his hand with the cordial words: "Thank you for that conversation. I listened to every word of

it." I replied: "Are you a fellow Christian?" "No," he said, "I am a Jewish rabbi chaplain in the army"! I then asked for his name so I could send him some literature, but he said, "I probably have it already, for I have a good Baptist chaplain friend in the army." Then we parted; but if the good Baptist chaplain brother will keep up the witness he is evidently bearing to this dear potential Jewish brother in the Lord, I confidently expect to see him again. "Those who love God never meet for the last time."

Could it have been pure accident that caused me to miss the train I wanted and so land right between two Jewish rabbis at once?

There is to me a greater thrill in presenting the claims of Christ to a Jew than to any other kind of unbeliever. As you open the Scriptures and allege that Jesus is the Christ, you almost necessarily follow the line of reasoning which we may be sure Paul followed in every town and synagogue where he first preached Christ to the Jews and then to the Greeks. I have never known a Jewish lawyer or layman who did not, under favorably private conditions for listening, show the most absorbed interest in this subject; and that these tragic people—so affectionate and lovable when once you have won their hearts and confidence and especially led them to Christ—constitute a particularly fruitful field for personal evangelism has been vividly brought home to me when I have dined with literally scores of Jewish Christians from all walks of life at the headquarters of the American Board of Missions to Jews: Oscar Wago, the famous engineer and friend of Fritz Kreisler, now gone on; dear old Brother Solomon; the recently converted Jewish former professor of International Law at the university of Jena; the former head of the high schools in Berlin; the skilled musicians, members of famous Austrian orchestras, and young men and maidens, bearded men and "mothers in Israel" all beaming with love and gratitude upon us their Gentile brethren whose missionary enterprise had given them faith in their Messiah with all the radiant hope of Israel more than restored!

I once had a Jewish tailor who served me for several years. Again and again he seemed to welcome the chance to hear a

Gentile talk about the claims of Jesus as his Messiah, provided his store were empty.

Once when he said we Gentiles could worship Jesus as God if we wanted, but no Jew ever would, his attention was called to the fact that at that very moment he was fulfilling one of the most improbable prophecies ever delivered: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. . . . And in his name shall the Gentiles trust,"¹—words penned by a Jew centuries ago, when a Gentile was even more an object of Jewish contempt and hatred than now, and when the thought that when the "Glory of Israel" should come He would be rejected and killed by Jews and accepted and loved by Gentiles would have rent to pieces the heart of a true son of Abraham. As then pointed out, the utter inconceivability of such a prediction may be partly grasped by imagining George Washington honored by every nation but the Americans, and Wellington by all but the British. The fact of fulfillment of compound prophesied events of even ordinary occurrence was a miracle whose reality was beyond argument, but in this case the things foretold were of such a paradoxical and apparently self-contradictory nature that beforehand no one could even imagine a way by which they could be fulfilled. This was illustrated by the inability of the ancient rabbis to devise even a theory how the things foretold about the Christ could be fulfilled in one man, so they resorted to the surmise that the Scriptures predicted two Messiahs—one of whom should be a patient sufferer who would be despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, who would give his back to the smiters and his cheek to spitting and those that plucked out the beard; and the other Messiah should be the "desire of all nations" and the "glory of thy people Israel," who should be "The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Things like this, detailed and, it would seem, inherently impossible, were prophesied centuries before every last detail was literally fulfilled in Christ and these two features multiplied upon each other constituted a phenomenon amazing beyond expression, which should overwhelm into assent every normal brain to which it was presented.

My Jewish friend was asked to notice how simply and natu-

¹ John 1: 11; Matthew 12: 21.

rally all these things were cleared up by the New Testament narrative, together with other astounding paradoxes: that He who should come was to do no violence, yet die as a felon; that although He was to die He was to live forever; that, though He was to be numbered among transgressors, He was to be honored with burial in a rich man's tomb, that, though He was to be executed and the only method of execution practiced by the Jews was stoning, which could hardly cause death without crushing the skull and was primarily calculated to shatter the bones, "a bone of him shall not be broken," but that they should "look on him whom they pierced," fulfilled by Christ's crucifixion, a method of execution utterly unknown at the time the prophecies were delivered; and that all this happened in the month of Nisan, exactly 483 years after the decree of the heathen King of Persia for the rebuilding of the Temple, precisely as foretold centuries in advance in the Book of Daniel—as my friend could verify by asking his rabbi to read the section I referred him to from the sacred scroll in his synagogue.

He was reminded that these prophecies, by which I was endeavoring to prove my case, were taken from his own holy books, treasured and preserved by his race at the cost of life itself all through the centuries and resting in his synagogue at that very moment; and that these books, though so loved and honored by his people, said worse things about the Jewish race than any other books and, instead of honoring their national exploits like all other national histories, declared the Jews to be a contemptible and stiff-necked race which never accomplished anything without outside help—the help of Jehovah their God, who alone was honored; and that these Jewish Scriptures were authenticated as to their genuineness as were no other books in the world in that they constituted not only the history of the Jewish race, without which their past and present were incomprehensible, but their law, without which their society would have been impossible, and not only their law and their history but their religion, their one imperishable national possession; finally, that in these books, and so linked up with their marvellous past, their strange and tragic present, and their rapidly developing and predicted future as to be part and parcel of them and as essential to them as each link in a chain to its

continuity, were recorded miracles without which unquestioned historical facts would be left without a cause or explanation, and prophecies delivered as far back as Moses and being fulfilled as recently as the very present moment at which we were talking.

Such things as these, he agreed, demanded an explanation; and when the explanation was such as to give back to each Jew who found it a hope and future brighter and more glorious than had been dreamed even in Solomon's day, and a Messiah who would not only rule over His adoring people in a radiant kingdom soon to come, but who had already done that even more wonderful and endearing thing—died for them, had been "made . . . sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him," had poured out the blood from His veins to cure the fever and torment of the disease of sin which, uncured, made all other things void in this world and any to come—he agreed that, if a man could believe it, the Gospel was indeed "good news." He was asked how he could imagine an improvement in any detail either as to the *prospect presented* or the *proof supporting it*—how there could be anything better than utter forgiveness for all sins and triumph over death, to be had as an entirely free gift, carrying with it from the donor and creating in the recipient a responsive affection so deep, and for a Being so glorious, as to promise the infinite ecstasy of a gratified and reciprocated love in a realm fairer than could be imagined, all to be held and enjoyed in fee simple irrevocably and forever.

At the close of one interview this Jewish tailor told me he was going to move away to Canada, and a few days later I found his shop vacant.

Just before this, however, a colored preacher one day came into my office, soliciting for some Home he represented, and said: "I had a strange experience a while ago. Around here on D Street I went into a Jew tailor shop and asked for and got a contribution, and the man said to me, 'You are a preacher, ain't you?'"

" 'Yes,' I said.

" 'And you believe that Jesus Christ was our Messiah, and you want us Jews to believe it, too?'"

"I told him yes, we wished they would; and then he said, 'Well, I believe He is.'"

The man he designated was my Jewish tailor, and he did not have any idea I even knew him. So the hope lives in my heart that this man, who had moved away before I could get to his store again, really found his Messiah "of whom Moses . . . and the prophets did write."

There was another Israelite who had a jewelry store near at hand. I took occasion one time, when his great depression was very manifest and we were alone in the store, to refer to these things. It was a rainy day and no customer came in for a long time. This man's eyes glowed with interest as we talked on, and frequently he interrupted with the words, "That is wonderful, that is wonderful."

I tried to see him alone several times after this, but never succeeded, his wife or some customer always interrupting, and his look of dismay when this happened kept me postponing for a better chance to talk with him. The last time I called at his shop another was in his place, and I was told that Mr. J—— had lost his mind and was in "St. Elizabeth's." I do not know how the doctors label his disorder, but I think I know what crazed him—the misery and despair that sooner or later choke any heart that is not supported by the joy and peace of believing.

XII

GIVING THE INFIDEL A HEARING

A CLOSET whose locked door hides a skeleton is much more oppressive than the skeleton itself, if the door is left open and the bony occupant dusted and handled and left open to view as the innocuous thing it is; so in the matter of Christian faith, many people go through life with a frightened feeling that if the infidelity of many famous men actually confronted them, their faith would be scared clean out of them. The glimpses of this terrifying thing afforded by such fragmentary familiarity as many have of infidel argument and attacks on the Bible lead to the belief that a fuller contact would be fatal. I have not found it so; and David Nelson writes that a complete familiarity with infidel writings was one of the reasons for his conversion, but only because he knew "the other side." I have sometimes based lectures entirely on texts taken from famous infidel works, and I would like to swing wide open the door which conceals this supposedly frightful skeleton in the uninstructed Christian's closet and see if it does not manifest itself as merely a bony bugaboo, without power to inflict even a qualm of fear or uncertainty in an instructed Christian. If we fling the door open upon Gibbon and Hume and Voltaire and Paine and Ingersoll and the president of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, the author of the recent book, "The Bible Unmasked," right down to a few-days-ago advertisement of one of the modern cults which tells us how to use God for our own purposes, we may feel that we have so taken apart this skeleton in the believer's closet as to see it is but a bundle of dry bones, so that we need never have goose flesh again as we pass it.

Among the things I love to remember are the long winter evenings in college days sitting by the big open fire, with my two dogs alternating between the hearth where they were too hot and the draft under the door where they were too cold, and

reading every word of that great historic masterpiece Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Gibbon was, of course, one of the ablest and most plausible of agnostics or deists, and he felt that such a marvellous thing as that a crucified Jewish peasant should in three hundred years be officially recognized as the true God by the Roman Empire called for an explanation. The real explanation being ruled out, of course, that it was the work of God, he suggested five others; but before considering them and the answer to them, it should be profitable to glance at portions of Archdeacon Paley's outline of the circumstances under which the thing was done.

Says Paley ("Evidences," p. 39):

"First then, the Christian Religion exists, and therefore by some means or other was established. Now it either owes . . . its establishment . . . its first publication, to the activity of the person who was the founder of the institution and those who were joined with him in the undertaking, or we are driven to the strange supposition that, although they might lie by, others would take it up. . . .

"Secondly, it is also highly probable from the nature of the case that the propagation of the new religion was attended with difficulty and danger. As addressed to the Jews, it was a system adverse not only to their habitual opinions, but to those opinions upon which their hopes, their partialities, their pride, their consolation were founded. This people, with or without reason, had worked themselves into a persuasion that some signal and greatly advantageous change was to be effected in the condition of their country by the agency of a long promised messenger from heaven . . . it was become the popular hope and passion and like all popular opinions, undoubting and impatient of contradiction. They clung to this hope under every misfortune of their country and with more tenacity as their dangers or calamities increased. To find, therefore, that expectations so gratifying were to be worse than disappointed; that they were to end in the diffusion of a mild, unambitious religion, which instead of victories and triumphs, instead of exalting their nation and institution above the rest of the world, was to advance those whom they despised to an equality with themselves in those very points of comparison in which they most valued their own distinction, could be no very pleasing discovery to a Jewish mind; nor could the messengers of such intelligence expect to be well received or easily credited. The doctrine was equally harsh and novel. The extending of the kingdom of God to those who did not conform to the law of Moses was a notion that had never before entered into the thoughts of a Jew.

"The character of the new institution was, in other respects, also, ungrateful to Jewish habits and principles. Their own religion was in

a high degree technical. Even the enlightened Jew placed a great deal of stress upon the ceremonies of his law, saw in them a great deal of virtue and efficacy; the gross and vulgar had scarcely anything else; and the hypocritical and ostentatious magnified them above measure as being the instruments of their own reputation and influence. The Christian scheme, without formally repealing the Levitical code, lowered its estimation extremely. . . . As if the frustration of the national hope was not enough, the long esteemed merit of ritual zeal and punctuality was to be decried, and that by Jews preaching to Jews.

"The ruling party at Jerusalem had just before crucified the Founder of the religion. That is a fact which will not be disputed. They, therefore, who stood forth to preach the religion must necessarily reproach these rulers with an execution which they could not but represent as an unjust and cruel murder. This would not render their office more easy or their situation more safe.

"With regard to the interference of the Roman government which was then established in Judea, I should not expect that, despising as it did the religion of the country, it would, if left to itself, animadvert either with much diligence or severity upon the schisms and controversies which arose within it. Yet there was that in Christianity which might easily afford a handle of accusation to a jealous government. The Christians avowed an unqualified obedience to a new Master. They avowed, also, that He was the person who had been foretold to the Jews under the suspected title of King. The spiritual nature of this kingdom, the consistency of this obedience with civil subjection were distinctions too refined to be entertained by a Roman president who viewed the business at a great distance or through the medium of a very hostile representation. . . .

"The preachers of Christianity had therefore to contend with prejudice backed by power.

"Let us inquire next what might reasonably be expected by the preachers of Christianity when they turned themselves to the heathen public. Now the first thing that strikes us is that the religion they carried with them was *exclusive*. It denied without reserve the truth of every article of heathen mythology, the existence of every object of their worship. It accepted no compromise; it admitted no comprehension. It must prevail, if it prevailed at all, by the overthrow of every statue, altar and temple in the world. It will not be easily credited that a design so bold as this could in any age be attempted to be carried into execution with impunity.

"For it ought to be considered that this was not setting forth or magnifying the character and worship of some new competitor for a place in the Pantheon, whose pretensions might be discussed or asserted without questioning the reality of any others; it was pronouncing all other gods to be false and all other worship vain. From the facility with which the polytheism of ancient nations admitted new objects of worship into the number of their acknowledged divinities, or the pa-

tience with which they might entertain proposals of this kind, we can argue nothing as to their toleration of a system or of the publishers and active propagators of a system which swept away the very foundation of the existing establishment. The one was nothing more than what it would be, in Popish countries, to add a saint to the calendar; the other was to abolish and tread underfoot the calendar itself.

"Nor do I think that the teachers of Christianity would find protection in the general disbelief of the popular theology, which is supposed to have prevailed amongst the intelligent part of the heathen public. It is by no means true that unbelievers are usually tolerant. They are not disposed (and why should they be) to endanger the present state of things by suffering a religion of which they believe nothing to be disturbed by another of which they believe as little. . . . The younger Pliny, polished as he was by all the literature of that soft and elegant period, could gravely pronounce this monstrous judgment: 'Those who persisted in declaring themselves Christians I ordered to be led away to punishment [that is execution] for I DID NOT DOUBT, *whatever it was that they confessed, that contumacy and inflexible obstinacy ought to be punished.*' His master, Trajan, a mild and accomplished prince, went, nevertheless, no further in his sentiments of moderation and equity than what appears in the following rescript: 'The Christians are not to be sought for, but if any are brought before you and convicted they are to be punished.' And this direction he gives after it had been reported to him by his own president that, by the most strict examination, nothing could be discovered in the principles of these persons but 'a bad and excessive superstition' accompanied, it seems, with an oath or mutual federation, 'to allow themselves in no crime or immoral conduct whatever.' The truth is the ancient heathen considered religion entirely as an affair of state, as much under the tuition of the magistrate as any other part of the police. The religion of that age was not merely allied to the state; it was incorporated into it. [A situation we see revived this very day in Germany and Japan.] Many of its offices were administered by the magistrate. Its titles of pontiffs, augurs and flamens were borne by senators, consuls and generals. Without discussing, therefore, the truth of the theology they resented every affront put upon the established worship as a direct opposition to the authority of government. . . .

"I am willing to accept the account of the matter which is given by Mr. Gibbon: 'The various modes of worship which prevailed in the Roman world were all considered by the people as equally true, by the philosopher as equally false, and by the magistrate as equally useful;' and I would ask from which of these three classes of men were the Christian missionaries to look for protection or impunity. Could they expect it from the people 'whose acknowledged confidence in the popular religion' they subverted from its foundation? from the philosopher who, 'considering all religions as equally false' would, of course, rank theirs among the number, with the addition of regarding them as

busy troublesome zealots? or from the magistrate who, satisfied with the 'utility' of the subsisting religion, would not be likely to countenance a spirit of proselytism and innovation—a system which declared war against every other and which, if it prevailed, must end in a total rupture of public opinion; an upstart religion, in a word, which was not content with its own authority, but must disgrace all the settled religions of the world? It was not to be imagined that he would endure with patience that the religion of the emperor and of the state should be calumniated and borne down by a company of superstitious and despicable Jews."

I skip much of Paley's invaluable material at this point, including the direct quotations from heathen historians as to the tortures inflicted on the early Christians, and finish consideration of this vital point in the case for the Bible—the fact that testimony to the facts set forth in the Gospels and Acts and Epistles was given and believed and acted upon in spite of persecution and torture, whereby we know the testimony of eyewitnesses to unmistakable facts was sincere and therefore true (and if the alleged facts are established so is established our fact-based Christian religion)—and come in closing to a characteristic Paley observation of the kind which so appeals to law trained men, an observation inherently and self-evidently true:

"Our books relate that Jesus Christ, the Founder of the religion, was in consequence of His undertaking put to death as a malefactor at Jerusalem. This point at least will be granted because it is no more than what Tacitus has recorded. . . .

"All the histories agree in representing Christ as foretelling the persecution of His followers.

"'Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted and shall kill you; and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. . . . The time cometh that whomsoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service. . . . But these things have I told you that when the time shall come ye may remember that I told you of them. . . .'

"I am not entitled," says Paley, "to argue from these passages that Christ actually did foretell these events, and that they did accordingly come to pass, because that would be at once to assume the truth of the religion; but I am entitled to contend that one side or other of the following disjunction is true: either that the evangelists have delivered what Christ really spoke and that the event corresponded with the prediction; or that they put the prediction into Christ's mouth because at the time of writing the history the event had turned out so to be: for the only two remaining suppositions appear in the highest degree incredible; which are either that Christ filled the minds of His followers

with fears and apprehensions without any reason or authority for what He said and contrary to the truth of the case; or that although Christ had never foretold any such thing, and the event would have contradicted Him if He had, yet historians who lived in the age when the event was known falsely as well as officiously ascribed these words to Him."

That under such conditions and against such handicaps a religion based on the alleged fact that a certain crucified Jewish peasant had risen from the dead in three centuries overthrew paganism and became, to its hurt, the state religion of the Roman Empire, was a phenomenon that called for explanation. Accordingly Gibbon gives five reasons in his history of Rome, which will be stated and largely left to speak for themselves.

First, Gibbon gives:

"The inflexible and, if you may use the expression, the intolerant zeal of the Christians, derived, it is true, from the Jewish religion, but purified from the narrow and unsocial spirit which, instead of inviting, had deterred Gentiles from embracing the law of Moses."

The early Christians and apostles did indeed have such zeal as led Paul, when stoned and left for dead at Lystra, to proceed to Derbe and resume preaching there, doubtless with his arm in a sling and only one eye clear of a head bandage; and they had such inflexible courage that the fires of Nero's garden and the lions of his arena could not induce them to cast even a little incense on the altar of a Pagan God. But does it not seem that this zeal and courage calls even louder for an explanation than the thing which it is tendered to explain? What but an assured conviction of the deity and resurrection of Christ and the heaven just beyond could have induced such conduct?

"The doctrine of a future life, improved by every additional circumstance which would give weight and efficacy to that important truth"

is the second explanation Gibbon gives to account for the rise of Christianity, after rejecting of course the true one. And the short answer may be suggested in question form: Why should the declarations of a future life delivered by Jewish fishermen, a Jewish tent maker and others have any more weight than the teachings of Socrates and the other great Greek and Roman philosophers, unless these particular Jews had something to back

up their statements which all other men had lacked? Certainly empty, unsupported promises of a future life (under conditions purified from all sensual, earthly appeal, such as that presented by Mohammed) could not "have turned the world upside down."

"The union and discipline of the Christian Church"

is—departing somewhat from the order Gibbon follows—another of the reasons given by him to account, without supernatural help, for the overthrow of paganism by Christianity. One has only to remember the schisms which arose in the Church almost as soon as there were enough members to have two opinions to realize how hard put to it Gibbon was when he gave this reason. "I am of Paul, I of Peter and I of Apollos" declared some of the early Christians, who were faulty, cantankerous men and women such as we are. "I beseech Euodias and Sintyche that they be of the same mind in the Lord," implored St. Paul. One thing which Protestant Christianity seems both unable and indifferent to produce is "union and discipline" among Christians, just so they revere the same written and worship the same divine resurrected Living Word.

"The virtues of the first Christians"

is one of Gibbon's five reasons which seems to be a thing demanding rather than affording an explanation. What power made these utterly immoral Corinthians and Romans so virtuous? "Now to your faith add virtue," writes Peter; but to turn a profligate man and immoral woman into "saints" whose standards were so high that Paul wrote that 'fornication and all uncleanness should not be so much as mentioned among' them calls for a power which this world never knew until Christ's religion supplied it. The immoral lives of Socrates and other "great and virtuous men," according to Pagan standards, of whom Plutarch writes, prove this if it need proof.

"The miraculous powers ascribed to the primitive Church"

was Gibbon's third, and is here the last natural cause he submits to account for the rise of the Church. I will ask Bishop

Watson, who replied to both Gibbon and to Tom Paine, to answer this last of the five points Gibbon gives:

"I should," says Watson ("Apology for Christianity"), "be willing to account the miracles, not merely ascribed to the primitive Church, but *really performed* by the apostles, as the one great primary cause of the conversion of the Gentiles. But waiving this consideration, let us see whether the miraculous powers which you ascribe to the primitive Church were in any eminent degree calculated to spread the belief of Christianity amongst a great and enlightened people.

"They consisted you tell us 'of divine inspirations, conveyed sometimes in the form of a sleeping, sometimes of a waking vision; and were liberally bestowed on all ranks of the faithful, on women as on elders, on boys as well as upon bishops.' 'The design of these visions,' you say, 'was for the most part either to disclose the future history or to guide the present administration of the Church.' You speak of 'the expulsion of demons as an ordinary triumph of religion, usually performed in a public manner; and when the patient was relieved by the skill or the power of the exorcist, the vanquished demon was heard to confess that he was one of the fabled gods of antiquity who had impiously usurped the adoration of mankind' and you represent even the miracle of the resurrection of the dead as frequently performed on necessary occasions.

"Cast your eye, sir," writes Watson, "upon the Church of Rome and ask yourself . . . whether her absurd pretensions to that very kind of miraculous power you have displayed as operating to the increase of Christianity have not converted half her members to Protestantism and the other half to infidelity. Neither the sword of the civil magistrate nor the possession of the keys of heaven, nor the terrors of her spiritual thunder have been able to keep within her pale even those who have been bred up in her faith; how then should you think that the very same cause which hath almost extinguished Christianity among Christians should have established it among Pagans?"

In considering these things from the famous author of probably the world's most famous history, we have given a hearing to the strongest part of this noted agnostic's attack against the basis of Christian faith. In other parts of his great history Gibbon is forced to relate historic facts, on the record of heathen contemporaries present at the frustration of Julian's effort to rebuild the Jewish temple and restore the Jews to Jerusalem for the specific purpose of "destroying faith in prophecy and revelation," to quote Gibbon's own words, which he himself says were "sufficient to convince a believing and astonish a skeptical mind."

If space permitted, the gifted author of the great work "The Rights of Man" and the trumpet-like phrase quoted by George Washington in an address to his soldiers "These are the times that try men's souls" would be considered in detail. About two years ago a young man I knew told me that he had given up his studies for the Catholic priesthood as a result of reading Paine's "Age of Reason." My statement that careful reading of this book—with the answers—had not so affected my faith, together with a brief mention of some of Paine's erroneous facts and illogical reasoning caused something akin to indignation, as I suppose few things could be more disturbing than to be forced to doubt whether after all one had been justified in throwing away Christian faith, with all it involves for time and eternity.

I can't remember ever meeting an infidel who had not read Paine nor one who had read Watson's reply to Paine. A sample of a more modern agnostic's bungling in attacking the Bible will be found if one read a widely advertised author's "History of the Bible" in which he states that the Jewish writer of the book of Daniel so arranged Nebuchadnezzar's end that (as the man who destroyed Jerusalem richly deserved) he died miserably in a field mooing like an ox. If one read the story as it is truly written and note how Nebuchadnezzar declares that his throne and kingdom and excellent majesty were added to him after his insanity had passed, this attack on the Bible becomes an argument for it, as one asks what reason short of divine and factual compulsion could induce a Jew to write such words about the great enemy of his people?

But to return to Paine who, by the way, supplies a notable and perfect illustration of something which David Nelson, who will be heard from later, says was one of the contributing causes to his conversion, *i. e.*, the consistent difference between the experience of men who thought they were but were not and those who really were dying: Paine writes that after producing the first part of his "Age of Reason" he was stricken with a fever that he and his friends thought would be fatal, and under those conditions he felt only satisfaction that he had written his first book against Christianity. Paine was not at the point of death. Later when he was his deathbed experience is one of the most famous and tragic of such incidents recorded.

It is Paine who in a tone of profound philosophical logic makes such observations on the variation in the Gospels and their incidents as he says cannot be controverted:

"That the agreement of all the parts of a story does not prove the story to be true, because the parts may agree and the whole be false. And second, that the disagreement of the parts of a story proves that the whole cannot be true. The agreement does not prove truth, but the disagreement proves falsehood positively,"

and that the Gospels or some other parts of the Bible "so far from being the solemn truth are not even a plausible lie" and do not agree on what was written on the cross nor in setting forth Christ's genealogy; that the story of the virgin birth is to be received with about as much credence as that of any young girl who claimed to be with child by a ghost; that the chaste and devoted Ruth the Moabitess was an immoral girl because she followed the innocent, rustic custom of her day in obeying Naomi's counsel "how to get a husband"; that Jeremiah was a false prophet and historian because he thought the improbable prediction about Zedekiah was and had turned out to be inherently impossible of fulfillment; he throws in a sample of his sordid thoughts into his comment on the witnesses of the resurrection that Mary, out of whom went the seven devils, seemed to be the woman best known to the apostles and was "doubtless on the stroll" when she first saw the resurrected Lord; that God could not have written a book in which the "smiling Canaanite babies" were sentenced to death and a man's sins are visited upon his children, etc.

To consider these things in a sentence or two, it may be said that his first "incontrovertible" proposition that variations in testimony "prove falsehood positively" would prove both sides of a court case wrong in just about every case that has ever been tried, and on the other hand it opens the way for that most conclusive of all tests of truth: the discovery of incidental, accidental harmonies in testimony whose spontaneous lack of collusion is proven by just those superficial, on the surface variations which Paine declares fatal to belief.

His comment on the virgin birth is a sample of that scurrility which is so suggestive in the author of the bitter hatred every infidel writer manifests, in contrast with the courteous, patient,

frank style of all the great Christian apologists, flowing from their serene assurance of the utter validity of their faith and reasons in support of it.¹ The same observation applies to his remarks about Ruth the wife of Boaz.

Every student of the Bible knows how marvelously was fulfilled every detail of the apparently contradictory prophetic judgment on Zedekiah.

The inveterate tendency to smear the name of every woman he mentions is illustrated by his leering, lewd reference to the Mary Magdalene who, whether or not she had been an immoral as well as a demon-possessed woman, was forgiven and loved by the Lord and was as utterly disassociated from the woman she had been as if she had never been that woman at all.

His argument that God is not the author of the Bible in which children as well as adults die by judicial decree and the earthquake gap in the earth which swallowed Korah, Dathan and Abiram as strongly proves that the God in whom he believed as a deist is not the author of the world in which and under whose providence now such things frequently take place. But enough of Paine.

Some fair samples of Ingersoll's and Voltaire's arguments against the Bible have been considered elsewhere. The presi-

¹ A pertinent observation should be made at this point.

If the bitter, scurrilous style of the infidel writings before us is kept in mind when we read extracts from great Christian apologists the question forces itself upon us why there should be this contrast between the excited sarcasm of Paine and Ingersoll and Voltaire, Lewis and Mr. Atheist Smith and even as far back as Celsus, Porphyry, Hierocles of the first few centuries, and the placid poise and benevolent patience of such genuine "freethinkers" as Greenleaf and Paley and Hopkins and McIlvaine and Alexander and Chalmers and Erskine and Horne and Lardner, and the manifest willingness they demonstrate to face and answer fully and fairly every possible argument and objection which prevents these and all other infidels from sharing the blessings they had found in believing. Twisting of facts and illogical reasoning cannot be found anywhere in apologetic writing as far as I can recall, while such things abound on almost every page of the infidel works. The Christian whose most sacred hopes and feelings and convictions are made the object of ridicule and unfair attack is the one whom we should expect to observe wrought to a pitch of excited resentment, while the infidel, holding nothing sacred, should normally be good-naturedly tolerant toward the harmless delusions of Christian faith. But we find bitter feeling where there should logically be mild indifference and mild benevolence and patient reasonableness where naturally should be expected resentment and indignation. Is not the explanation suggested that the Christian has the calm assurance of assured truth and the unbeliever the angry unrest of being consciously or unconsciously in the wrong?

"The natural heart is enmity against God."

dent of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism many years ago sent me a publication, following the printing of some articles I had written for the *Sunday School Times*, which he contended would wipe away all traces of such credulous folly as I had been propounding.

His challenge was worded as follows:

"To a candid world we submit this document. If it is true, the Church ought to go out of business. If the clergy can disprove it, we shall cease attacking the Bible.

"This folder indicts the Bible as inauthentic, incredible and immoral, supporting each charge with evidence. Refute it, Christians, if you can, or confess that your religion is false. Clergymen, Sunday School teachers, Bible Societies and Institutes, Gideons, Daughters of the American Revolution and Federated Clubwomen, can you answer?

"Is the evidence true? Look up the references. Read with an open mind. Decide for yourself."

To which we say Amen and "may the best man win" or rather the truth appear. (See Appendix "G" for what was then published by him and my reply.)

Mr. Dan Gilbert at one time reported that a professor in a large state university had made before his class a bitter attack on the Ten Commandments, which Blackstone—whose writings introduce the young lawyer to his profession—declares the basis of all law. The almost fiendish ingenuity and plausibility of his attack together with an attempt to reply to it appears as Appendix "F."

The sinful and immoral acts truthfully recorded in the Bible constituted the basis for the attack made in a book called "The Bible Unmasked" published a half dozen years or so ago, of which an advertisement was sent to me, resulting in an exchange of letters between the author and myself. My letter to Mr. Lewis, the author, appears as Appendix "C."

I think we may feel now that we have pretty fully exposed ourselves to all the terror and injury to a well founded faith that the infidel skeleton in the closet can inflict after devoting this much attention to it, but for stimulating, zestful hearing or reading nothing can excel a skilful argument between able lawyers, and in Appendix "H" appears a condensed report of a famous but forgotten work published about the year 1729 by the Bishop of London, Rev. Thomas Sherlock, D. D., *The Trial*

of the Witnesses, manifestly based upon an actual disputation between lawyers or written by a law trained author.

To bring our consideration of infidelity, ancient and modern, right down to date let us think for a moment upon an advertisement that appeared in the morning papers on this 6th day of April, 1943, with the heading "Is God Dead?" and the picture of a benevolent looking gentleman who contends that He is not and that "every normal human being can, here and now, USE this staggering Power." This religious cult is only one of many that will disclose by mail for a fee or an offering the secret how to USE the "staggering Power" which is God—not how to get forgiven and get right with Him and then serve and obey and glorify Him and receive at His sovereign good pleasure such blessings or discipline as He may in His love bestow! Carlyle once wrote: "The older I grow, and I now stand on the brink of eternity, the more comes back to me the answer to the first question of the Westminster Catechism: 'What is man's chief end? Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever.'"

Glorifying God and having the resulting infinite joy of doing so, is as far from the selfish, depraved desire and scheme to use Him for our own convenience—ringing the bell for Him, using the magic formula when we want a little service—as is the heaven to which one teaching leads from the hell which is the deserved goal of the other.

When there is every possible blessing and benefit promised by any false cult to be found "in the apostles' doctrine" why should men seek so frantically for help in any way proposed, just so it is not through the crucified Christ? "The natural heart is enmity against God" is the answer. "And men love darkness better than light."

XIII

CALLING MARK HOPKINS TO THE WITNESS STAND

THAT my readers may the better judge whether there is good ground for my enthusiasm for the subject of Christian Evidences and the authors who have written upon it I want to put before them at this time a somewhat fuller extract from the words of one of the world's most revered scholars who devoted the best energies of his powerful and well stored mind to the question whether we have in the Bible an authentic revelation from God. In the extract I am about to quote he refers to matters in support of Christian faith which the bewildering profusion of material surrounding the subject has made it impracticable heretofore even to mention. It is my hope that samples such as this from the great apologetic writers may revive an interest in the intellectual wealth our generation has inherited from a former generation and almost forgotten, so that, as President Woodrow Wilson once declared, we are "now living on the interest from spiritual investments of our forefathers."

As we read some of the reasons why the scholarly men we have had testify in this matter were so utterly sure of themselves and their convictions is it not a pertinent inquiry to address to ourselves whether our different views, if such we hold, are the result of greater or less careful research, reflection and mental ability than these men put into their conclusions? Even though maintaining our unquestioned right as "freethinkers" to reason and conclude as seems best to us, should not the reflection that it is our own eternal destiny that is at stake in this matter compel any rational man to investigate it with the awestruck care which the awful issue involved demands? If the infidel is right, the Christian's glad hope is at worst doomed to extinction in the black wave of nothingness; but if the Christian is right,

the infidel faces an eternity such as contemptuous neglect and flouting of the infinite sacrifice of Christ deserves, and the loss of an eternal existence of almost infinite felicity.

High stakes and high odds! In view of the high stakes of the infidel ought not the odds to be almost infinitely in his favor? But who can deny that they are the reverse of this and infinitely against his being right in his unbelief? Infinite odds, not compensating, but compounding the risk of the infidel's infinite wager of his soul's eternal welfare! Consider which way the odds appear to be in reading the next few pages.

I quote from that great teacher and college president of whom President Garfield declared that a university consisted of "Mark Hopkins on one end of a log and a student on the other." I start at page 279 of Mark Hopkins' "Evidences" simply because I must start somewhere, and at this point our famous American scholar presents to us the invincible argument of an even earlier great English thinker, who first called attention to the probative force of the Jewish and Christian memorial institutions observed to this day. Hopkins says:

"We now come to an argument for the credibility of the facts contained in our books which never has been answered and never can be. Infidels have repeatedly been challenged to answer it but they have never even made the attempt. It is the argument of Leslie in his *Short and Easy Method with the Deists*. This argument rests solely upon the peculiarity of Christian evidence, already mentioned, by which the truth of the religion is indissolubly connected with certain matters of fact which could originally be judged of by the senses, and also upon the fact that there exist in the Church certain ordinances commemorative of those facts. Thus the truth of our religion seems to be embodied in institutions that now exist, and in observances that pass before our eyes. The object of Leslie is to show, from the nature of the case—for here we make very little reference to written testimony—that the matters of fact stated could not have been received at the time unless they were true, and that the observances could never have been originated except in connection with the facts. In showing this, he lays down four rules, and asserts that any matter of fact in which these four rules meet must be true, and challenges the world to show any instance of any supposed matter of fact, thus authenticated, that has ever been shown to be false.

"*Four rules.*—His four rules are these: 1. 'That the matter of fact be such that men's outward senses, their eyes and ears, may be judges of it.' 2. 'That it be done publicly, in the face of the world.' 3. 'That not only public monuments be kept up in memory of it, but some

outward actions be performed.' 4. 'That such monuments, and such actions, or observances, be instituted, and do commence from the time that the matter of fact was done.'

"*The first two rules.*—'The first two rules make it impossible for any such matter of fact to be imposed upon men at *the time*, because every man's eyes, and ears, and senses, would contradict it. For example, if any man should affirm that all the inhabitants of this city yesterday, or last year, walked to Governor's Island and returned on dry ground, while the water was divided and stood in heaps on each side of them, it would be impossible that he should be believed, because every man, woman, and child would know better. It would be one of those things respecting which the unlearned and the young could judge as well as the learned and the more experienced. Equally impossible is it that the children of Israel, of *that generation*, should have believed that they passed through the Red Sea, or went out and gathered manna every morning, or drank water from the rock, or that the law was given with the terror and solemnity described in the Bible, if these things did not happen. Not less impossible is it that the five thousand should have believed they were fed by Christ; or that the relatives of Lazarus, and the Jews who knew him, should have believed that he was raised from the dead, or the parents and friends of the man born blind, that he was made to see; or that the multitudes before whom he healed the lame, and the sick of every description, should have believed that these events took place, if they did not. These miracles are of such a nature that, unless they were really wrought, it is impossible they should have been believed at the time.'

"Leslie further says: 'Therefore it only remains that such matter of fact might be invented some time after, when the men of that generation wherein the thing was said to be done are all past and gone; and the credulity of after ages might be imposed upon to believe that things were done in former ages which were not.'

"*The last two rules.*—'And for this the last two rules secure us as much as the first two rules in the former case; for, whenever such a matter of fact came to be invented, if not only monuments were said to remain of it, but likewise that public actions and observances were constantly used ever since the matter of fact was said to be done, the deceit must be detected by no such monuments appearing, and by the experience of every man, woman, and child, who must know that no such actions or observances were ever used by them.' 'For example,' continues Leslie, 'suppose I should now invent a story of such a thing done a thousand years ago; I might perhaps get some to believe it; but if I say that not only such a thing was done, but that, from that day to this, every man, at the age of twelve years, had a joint of his little finger cut off; and that every man in the nation did want (lack) a joint of such a finger; and that this institution was said to be part of the matter of fact done so many years ago, and vouched as a proof and confirmation of it, and as having descended without interruption, and

been constantly practiced, in memory of such matter of fact, all along from the time that such matter of fact was done;—I say it is impossible I should be believed in such a case, because everyone could contradict me as to the mark of cutting off the joint of the finger; and that, being a part of my original matter of fact, must demonstrate the whole to be false.'

"*Application to books of Moses.*—The case here put is not stronger than that either of the books of Moses, or of the New Testament. For, at whatever time it might have been attempted to impose the books of Moses upon a subsequent age, it would have been impossible, because they contain the laws and civil and ecclesiastical regulations of the Jews, which the books affirm were adopted at the time of Moses, and were constantly in force from that time; and because they contain an account of the institution of the passover, which they assert to have been observed in consequence of a particular fact. If, then, a book had been put forth at a particular time, stating that the Jews had obeyed certain very peculiar laws, and had a certain priesthood, and had observed the passover from the time of Moses, while they had never heard of these laws, or of this priesthood, or of a passover, it is impossible the book should have been received. Nothing could have saved such a book from scorn or utter neglect.

"*To the New Testament.*—But what the Levitical law, and the priesthood, and the passover were to the Jews, baptism, and the Christian ministry, and the Lord's Supper are to Christians. It is a part of the records of the Gospels that these were instituted by Christ; that they were commanded by Him to be continued till the end of time, and were actually continued and observed at the time when the Gospels purport to have been written—that is, before the destruction of Jerusalem. But if these books were fictions invented after the time of Christ, there would have been at that time no Christian baptism, nor order of Christian ministers, nor sacrament of the supper, thus derived from His appointment; and that, alone, would have demonstrated the whole to be false. Our books suppose these institutions to exist; they give an account of them; and it is impossible they should have been received where they did not exist. It is, therefore, impossible that these books should have been received at the time the facts are said to have taken place, or at any subsequent time, unless those facts really did take place. We now regard the sacrament of the supper as an essential part of the religion; it was so regarded by our fathers; nor can we conceive that it should have been otherwise up to the very time when the religion was founded. Thus we have a visible sign and pledge of the truth of our religion, handed down, independently of written testimony, from age to age; and the force of which age has no tendency to diminish.

"*Strength of the evidences.*—Perhaps we do not sufficiently dwell on the great strength which the Christian evidences derive from this proof, or notice the contrast it makes between the evidence for the facts of Christianity and those of ordinary history. Not only is it impossible to

point out any statement of fact, substantiated by these four marks, that can be shown to be false, but none of the best authenticated facts of ancient history have them all. The Fourth of July, as observed by us, may illustrate the effects of such commemorative ordinances as guarding against false historical accounts. For any man to have invented the New Testament after the time of Christ, and to have attempted to cause it to be received, would have been as if a man had written an account of the Revolution, and of the celebration of this day from the first, when no revolution was ever heard of, and no one had ever celebrated the Fourth of July. Nor, when such a festival was once established, would it be possible to introduce any account of its origin essentially different from the true one. But the case of the Christian religion is much stronger; because we have several different institutions which must have sprung up at its origin; because baptism and the Lord's Supper have occurred so much more frequently; and because the latter has always been considered the chief rite of a religion to which men have been more attached than to liberty or to life.

"Two great arguments.—Thus I have brought into close juxtaposition these two great arguments. We have seen that it was impossible that the apostles should have been either deceivers or deceived, and that the books could not have been received, either at the time they purport to have been written, or at any subsequent time, if the facts recorded had not taken place.

"Credible because no others.—But again: our books are credible because there are no others. That such a movement as Christianity must have been, involving the origin of so many new institutions, and such ecclesiastical and social changes should have originated at such a time, and in such a place, and that no written documents should have been drawn forth by it, is incredible. And that the true account should have perished, leaving not a vestige behind it, and that false ones, and such as these, should have been substituted, is impossible. Of the origin of such institutions we should expect some account. That of our books is adequate and satisfactory. There is nothing contradictory to it, for even spurious writings confirm the truth of our books, and there is no vestige of any other."

Following is another sample of the facts and reasoning to be found on practically every one of the 371 pages constituting Mark Hopkins' "Evidences." He writes:

"All the evidence hitherto adduced has been drawn from our own books (the Scriptures), or from the nature of the case. Let us now turn to that which we may derive from heathen writers, and from other sources. This evidence must be noticed, because there are those who attach to it a peculiar value. There are those who give a weight to the testimony of Tacitus the heathen, which they would not have given to that of Tacitus the Christian.

"The contemporary writers, Jewish and heathen . . . are numerous; and whatever, in any of them, throws light on the manners, or habits, or sects, or forms of government, or general condition of the inhabitants of Palestine and the surrounding countries, will enable us to put to a most decisive test those who describe with any minuteness important events passing upon such a scene.

"*The Talmud*.—Of Hebrew literature, then, we have the Talmud, a collection of Jewish traditions, the compilation of which was commenced as early as the second century. This speaks of Christ, and of several of the disciples, by name. It speaks also of His crucifixion. It admits, also, that He performed many and great miracles, but imputes His power to His having learned the right pronunciation of the ineffable name of God, which, it says, He stole out of the Temple, or to the magic arts which He learned in Egypt. These writings are specific in their statements respecting the destruction of Jerusalem, and throw much light on the sects and customs of the Jews.

"*Greek writers—Josephus*.—Of Greek writers, we cite first Josephus, who, though he was a Jew by birth, and a Roman by association and habits, yet wrote in Greek. Josephus lived at the time many of these events are said to have happened, and was present at the destruction of Jerusalem. In him, therefore, we have the most ample means of ascertaining everything relating to Jewish sects, and customs, and opinions, and of testing the accuracy of our books respecting many dates and names of persons and places.

"And, on all hands, it is agreed that, so far as Josephus goes, he confirms the accuracy of our books. Everything said in relation to the sects of the Jews, and the Herods, and Pilate, and the division of Provinces, and Felix, and Drusilla, and Bernice, had just that agreement with our accounts which we should expect in independent historians. The account given by Josephus of the death of Herod is strikingly similar to that of Luke. The account by Luke you will remember.¹ Josephus says that Herod came into the theater early in the morning, dressed in a robe or garment made wholly of silver, and that the reflection of the rays of the rising sun from the silver gave him a majestic and awful appearance, and that in a short time his flatterers exclaimed, one from one place and another from another, though not for his good, that he was a god, and they entreated him to be propitious to them. He then adds, 'Immediately after, he was seized with pain in his bowels, extremely violent, and was carried to the palace.' Luke gives the cause of the pain, saying he was eaten of worms.

"Do we find in the New Testament the Jews calling upon Pilate to crucify Jesus, and saying, 'We have no power to put any man to death'? Josephus says that they had the free exercise of their religion, and the power of accusing and prosecuting, but not of putting any man to death.

¹ Acts 12: 21-23.

"Do we find the Roman captain, when Paul was arrested, asking, Art not thou that Egyptian, which before these days madest an uproar, and leddest out into the wilderness four thousand men that were murderers?' We find in Josephus a full account of the transaction, which happened under the government of Felix, and, what is remarkable, Josephus does not mention his name, but everywhere calls him 'the Egyptian,' and 'the Egyptian false Prophet.'

"Do our books speak of Pharisees, and Sadducees, and Herodians? Josephus confirms all that is said of these in the minutest particulars.

"Does Luke speak of soldiers who went to John the Baptist, using a word (*strateuomenoi*) which indicates that they were then under arms and marching to battle? Josephus tells us that Herod was then at war with Aretas, his father-in-law, and that a body of soldiers was at that very time marching through the region where John was.

"Does Luke speak of Herod as reproved by John for Herodias, his brother Philip's wife? Josephus tells us it was on his account that Herod had sent back his wife, and that the war was undertaken.

"Does Paul say of Ananias, when reproached for reviling God's high priest, 'I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest'? We find, from Josephus, that Ananias had been deposed, and his successor murdered, and that in the interim, when there really was no high priest, Ananias had usurped the place.

"Does Luke speak of a body of soldiers stationed at Caesarea, called the Augustan band? Josephus says that though that garrison was chiefly composed of Syrian soldiers, yet that there was a small body of Roman soldiers stationed there, called by this title, and he applies to them the very Greek term used by Luke.

"So minute and perfect are these coincidences that no one can resist the conviction that the writers of our books lived and acted in the scenes which they relate. . . .

"*Demosthenes*.—But, again: does Luke speak of the Athenians as spending their time in hearing and telling some new thing? We find Demosthenes, long before, inquiring of them whether it was their sole ambition to wander through the public places, each inquiring of the other, 'What news?' Does Paul speak of the Cretans as liars? We find that to 'Cretize' was a proverbial expression, among the ancients, for lying.

"*Testimony of Pilate*.—Before citing two Latin authors, I will say a word of what may be called 'official' testimony to the facts of Christianity. Its early defenders, as Justin Martyr, in his first 'Apology,' addressed to 'the emperor and senate of Rome,' and Tertullian, addressing the Roman governor of his Province, appeal to the official communications of Pilate to the emperor Tiberius, as confirming their statements concerning Christ. The confidence with which they invite an examination of the public records, and of the other sources of information—and this at a time when such an examination would certainly disclose the facts—shows their unhesitating faith, not only as to

the truth of the Christian history, but also as to the abundant evidence then existing and accessible, by which it was supported. If no such documents had existed, it would have been mere foolhardiness thus to refer to them; if they did exist, how perfect the evidence!

"*Tacitus*.—But I pass to Tacitus, whose testimony even Gibbon admits must be received. In connection with an account of the burning of Rome, in the tenth year of Nero, A. D. 64, which was imputed by Nero to the Christians, he tells us that Christ was put to death by Pontius Pilate, who was the procurator under Tiberius, as a malefactor; that the people called Christians derived their name from him; that this superstition arose in Judea, and spread to Rome, where at that time, only about thirty years after the death of Christ, the Christians were very numerous. The words of Tacitus, in speaking of them, are, '*ingens multitudo*,' a great multitude. It is obvious, also, from the account of Tacitus, that the Christians were subjected to contempt and the most dreadful sufferings. 'Their executions,' says he, 'were so contrived as to expose them to derision and contempt. Some were covered over with the skins of wild beasts, that they might be torn to pieces by dogs; some were crucified; while others, being daubed over with combustible materials, were set up as lights in the night-time, and were thus burnt to death.' This account is confirmed by Suetonius, and by Martial and Juvenal. In his first satire, Juvenal has the following allusion, which I give as translated by Mr. Gifford:

Now dare

To glance at Tigellinus, and you glare
In that pitched shirt in which such crowds expire,
Chained to the bloody stake, and wrapped in fire.

"This testimony of Tacitus, confirmed as it is, is perfectly conclusive respecting the time and the main facts of the origin of Christianity.

"*Pliny*.—It would here be in place to quote the whole of the celebrated letter of Pliny to Trajan, and the reply; but as these are so well known, I will simply give two brief passages, one respecting the character, and the other the numbers, of the Christians.

"Pliny was *propraetor* of Pontus and Bithynia, a part of Asia remote from Judea, and the letter was written but a little more than seventy years after the death of Christ. Many were brought before him for their faith in Christ. If they remained steadfast in it, refusing to offer incense to the idols, he condemned them to death for their 'inflexible obstinacy.' Under this fear numbers consented to deny Christ. Of those accused, many said that they had once been Christians, 'but had abandoned that religion, some of them three years before, some of them longer, and some even twenty years before.' 'They affirmed,' says he, '—that is, those who said they had once been Christians, but were not then—' that the whole of their fault, or error, lay in this, that they were wont to meet together on a stated day before it was light, and sing among themselves, alternately, a hymn to Christ, as God, and bind

themselves, by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, not to be guilty of theft, or robbery, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor to deny a pledge committed to them when called upon to return it. When these things were performed, it was their custom to separate, and then to come together again to a meal, which they ate in common without any disorder.' This account seemed so extraordinary to Pliny, that he applied torture to two women, but discovered nothing more.

"The passage in regard to number is: 'Suspending, therefore, all judicial proceedings, I have recourse to you for advice; for it has appeared to me a matter highly deserving consideration, especially on account of the great number of persons who are in danger of suffering; for many of all ages and every rank, of both sexes likewise, are accused, and will be accused. Nor has the contagion of this superstition seized cities only, but the lesser towns also, and the open country.' Here we find the testimony given in our books of the progress of the religion fully confirmed. Pontus and Bithynia were remote Provinces, and it does not appear that the Christian religion had spread more rapidly there than elsewhere. How strong must have been that primitive evidence for Christianity which could induce these persons, persons of good sense, in every walk of life, to abandon the religion of their ancestors, and thus, in the face of imperial power, to persist in their adherence to one who had suffered the death of a slave!

"*Other writers.*—We might also refer to Celsus, and Lucian, and Epictetus, and the Emperor Marcus Antoninus, and Porphyry—who all throw light on the early history of Christianity, and all confirm, so far as they go, the accounts of our books.

"*Coins, medals, inscriptions.*—There is a single species of evidence more, that I will just mention—that which is derived from ancient coins, medals, and inscriptions. The most striking of these relate to the credibility of the Old Testament; still, valuable confirmation to the New is not wanting, and I mention it because it shows how every possible line of evidence converges on this point.

"Luke gives to Sergius Paulus a title belonging only to a man of proconsular dignity, and it had been doubted whether the governor of Cyprus had that dignity. A coin, however, has been found struck in the reign of Claudius Caesar (the very reign in which Paul visited Cyprus), and under Proclus, who succeeded Sergius Paulus, on which the very title applied by Luke is given to Proclus. Luke speaks of Philippi as a colony, and the word implies that it was a Roman colony. It was mentioned as such by no other historian, and hence the authority of Luke was questioned. But a medal has been discovered which shows that this dignity was conferred upon that city by Julius Caesar. It is implied, in the nineteenth of Acts, that there was a great zeal at Ephesus for the worship of Diana; and a long inscription has been found there, by which it appears that, at one time, a whole month was set apart to games and festivals in honor of her.

"There have also been found, in the catacombs at Rome, inscrip-

tions which show, in a touching manner, in opposition to the insinuations of Gibbon and of some later writers, the cruelty of the early persecutions, and the number of those who suffered martyrdom. Much evidence of this kind might be added.

"Weak and obstinate skepticism.—Thus have we every conceivable species of historical proof, both external and internal. Thus do the very stones cry out. And, my hearers, if there may be such a thing as a weak and obstinate credulity, may there not also be such a thing as a skepticism equally weak and obstinate?"

Pierre Loti, the French novelist, once expressed a willingness to part with his reason if he could thereby have the cheer of the Christian's "illusion." Does it not appear that in the light of the facts and proof that God has provided to support Christian faith, if he had attended to them, he would have had to abandon his reason not to have it?

XIV

THE BUSINESS OF LIVING

IN THE LIGHT OF BIBLE PROMISES

GIVING counsel and advice which vitally affect fame, fortune and often life itself is probably the most responsible part of a lawyer's work. To presume to advise anyone, as I have done not only in church but in a practical law office, to look to an utterly unseen Being for guidance and to expect real and material effects to come out of the invisible spiritual realm to the alteration and relief of impossible situations in this earthly one requires an exercise of faith no matter how often it is done. The jauntily confident words of many pious writers and speakers have sometimes seemed to me to be too lightly uttered and to be based more on youthful, credulous enthusiasm and lack of the hardships of experience than upon seasoned judgment and actual verification of the promises quoted. This is one reason, it seems to me, why any church is so fortunate which has a veteran, battle-scarred, aged saint for a preacher who knows from personal experience whereof he speaks—even as sailors in the "windjamming days" of the clippers always preferred a "skipper with grey in his beard." It costs little to declare we hope this promise is reliable; it is at the cost of "blood, sweat and tears" that the pastor can tell his people, "I have proved this promise many a time and know it is God's word," and can be depended upon. "Young men for action, old men for counsel"—and preaching! (Bacon.)

The Devil has more than once gone with me even to Christian conferences and, presuming on earlier and long repudiated association in times past, has insinuated the suggestion, even between verses of a hymn maybe, that "this is just a pious conspiracy to whip up enthusiasm, each man trying to use

expressions of confidence heartier than those of the preceding speaker and to drown out deep inner uncertainty about these hazy things by loud singing and exhortation." And knowing that it is a lawyer's habit to give a full hearing to his opponent though this is not the right course with a tricky antagonist like the Devil, he has gone on, "Now frankly between man and Devil, two rational beings anyway, would you give as your last business advice to your sons, in view of some of your experiences, the counsel to seek and actually count on guidance and help from God in business matters?" When he mentioned my two naval officer sons he made me think:

Are earthly problems and heavenly promises not incommensurable things that can't be dealt with together or balanced against each other—like the two apples that can't be divided into six oranges we learned about when studying arithmetic as children? To trust God to give help when I come to die is all right because we have to and it is a long way in the future anyway; but is it a sensible, practical thing to expect something actual to happen in response to thinking words or saying them to an invisible Being that a lot of smart folks say doesn't exist and, if He does, is too far away and busy with billions of bigger worlds to know or care what happens to any speck of life on this inhabited speck of dust? If it were not that I am sure that what the Bible tells us about God is true my answer would certainly be "No." The proofs being conclusive that the Bible is the message to us of the Almighty One, the answer is "Yes."

But no matter how well proved and believed a thing may be, to act in "unhedged" reliance upon it is as much harder than merely assenting to it as it is harder for a man to leap into space than to entertain a merely academic confidence in his parachute. So the heartiest mental conviction that God inspired the writing of the Bible and backs the promises it contains, does not prevent there being pangs as well as "peace and joy in believing"—at least I have found it so. Believing a thing singing in church is not exactly the same (or rather it is the same but feels different) as believing it when you get the notice from the bank telling of the interest money due you haven't on hand.

I thought I had experienced a good variety of trials of faith, from depending on God's help to take the yacht and family

through northeasters at sea to getting them fed and educated ashore, but there were some spiritual muscles which had evidently been neglected—as a man finds the muscles under his thighs have been when he makes the steep return trip down a mountainside. Lacking experience with a mortgage or note in bank my spiritual muscles for carrying financial burdens were weak and I didn't understand the deferential attitude of some of my friends toward a bank president, whose chief business seems to be sending you every three weeks reminders of that maturing ninety day note (for maturing is a habit notes have beyond any man's power to believe anterior to experience!). I lacked much experience in proving the truth of Bible promises of supply of financial needs. But the strain of faith comes before the rest of faith, and that strain is necessary to strengthen and make bold the bashful, shrinking "inner man" who would like to avoid all spiritual struggle and live soft and die a weakling; and apparently the Lord considers money matters as among the most convenient and effective of His faith exercisers. George Mueller and Hudson Taylor grew to be two of the mightiest men of spiritual valor largely through the exercise of faith for the supply of financial needs and having these needs, without any man knowing what they were, supplied at the last moment so many hundreds—"nay thousands of times," says Mueller—as to eliminate all possible explanations but that God did it.

It was Hudson Taylor who wrote that "really to believe God is to enter at once upon the possession of a great estate." The possession of a great estate is supposed, at least it was at an earlier day, to preserve a man from anxiety as to the supply of his future needs, to provide ample provision for all present wants and so enable its possessor to gratify every desire as to cause him great joy and contentment. As a matter of fact we all know that rarely if ever has it done all or many of these things, and Matthew Henry gives us one of his famous aphorisms when he writes about riches to the effect that: "There is labor in the getting of them, care in the keeping of them, responsibility in the use of them, guilt in the abuse of them, sorrow in the loss of them and a heavy accounting to be given for them in the end"—to all of which propositions a man has to

assent, though his general conclusion is that he is willing to take the risk of them "for a' that and a' that."

A sufficiently real and demonstrably trustworthy reliance upon God, however, manifestly gives all the advantages with none of the drawbacks of a "great estate." Freedom from want? God has promised to supply every need "according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus." Freedom from anxiety for future needs and experiences? "Be anxious for nothing, but in all things by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving make known your requests unto God and the peace of God shall garrison your hearts and minds in Christ Jesus."

The faith we exercise toward God's provision for our needs in this life is the same as the faith we exercise for the salvation of our souls in the life to come; and we can estimate the strength of the one by the other. The Bible's promises of guidance are among the most categorical in it, and a strong test of faith often develops out of believing these promises and acting upon them, in spite of the Devil's jibe that we are fools to mix faith with business and would be wiser to rely solely on hard common sense and not expect anything real out of them here, leaving such things to the other life, if any, when if they prove empty words it will be too late to do anything about it anyway. I can remember two definite times and places where Satan himself whispered in my ear the most venomous words and thoughts of resentment at the ill results which he said had followed my adopting a course of action after long prayer for guidance, which seemed to have led to nothing but confusion upon disaster. I remember the distinct advice to get a gun, fire some shots at the heavens as an act of defiance and resentment and then a last one to join him in hell in hating God forever and ever! And a few months after that "battle in the orchard," for it took place in the old orchard of the lovely old home I had left after long prayer for guidance and what seemed a clear intimation from God,—there came deliverance from my difficulties (at least temporarily, for as this is being written all previous problems and partial deliverances seem to be coming to either a good or mocking end)* through the most unexpected source imaginable: a penniless drunkard converted fifteen years before!

* February 1946. The end was good. I. H. L.

When Mueller once wrote that God had a thousand ways to deliver us he may have had in mind the breakdown of the milkman's wagon; but I doubt if even he ever had help come from so unlikely a source as that.

I commend the reading of George Mueller's "Life of Faith" to anyone whose distress and dilemma seem impossible either to bear or to solve. But then Satan has often suggested, as I found comfort in remembering the Lord's dealings with Mueller, that "Mueller was a saint who spent his life caring for orphans and no subnormal Christian like you can hope for any such experiences as he had." As I look back however it seems to me that God manifestly made provision even for me at one time of need as remarkably as He did so often for Mueller, and I would tell of this for the comfort of other Christians who may feel, as I did, too far removed "from his class" to gather hope from his experience. Of course we know that God helped Mueller not because of his goodness but because he trusted in Him; and by the help of the Holy Spirit we may all do that and remember that the word "Say ye to the righteous it shall be well with him" applies to anyone who sincerely and consistently trusts in Christ's imputed righteousness and conscientious promises.

There are few, doubtless, who do not remember that George Mueller was the man who founded the Bristol Orphanages which are still operating on the faith principle he adopted and who during a long lifetime deliberately refused to tell or to be let known to any but God his needs from day to day to keep his hundreds, finally several thousands, of orphans clothed, housed and fed. With no endowment, with the desperately reckless habit—humanly speaking—of disbursing almost at once for missionary and other good causes as well as his orphan work, any large sums of money the Lord sent in, he literally lived year after year and day after day from God's hand to his mouth; and as soon as his empty bins and treasury were filled on one day he was in acute need the day following. The closest call I remember to an apparent failure of God to provide was on the occasion when the time came to thank God for the breakfast they did not have when the blessing started but did have before it ended, through the breakdown at the door of the orphanage of the milk dealer's wagon at that moment, which benevolent

breakdown was supplemented by the simultaneous appearance of the town baker with sufficient loaves of bread, which he said the Lord had made him get out of bed and prepare for that morning.

Here is a paragraph or two from Mueller's writings that have been such a comfort to me that the page on which it is written is filled with penciled dates of the times during the last decade or more when I have felt utterly cast upon God to make good the assurance I have often reminded Him of: "The Lord God will help me; therefore shall I not be confounded." George Mueller uses as his text the fifth verse of the forty-third Psalm:

"WHY ART THOU CAST DOWN, O MY SOUL?"

"Is there ever any ground to be cast down? There are two reasons, but only two. If we are as yet unconverted, we have ground to be cast down; or if we have been converted and live in sin, we are rightly cast down.

"But except for these two things there is no ground to be cast down, for all else may be brought before God in prayer with supplications and thanksgiving. And regarding all our necessities, all our difficulties, all our trials, we may exercise faith in the power of God and in the love of God.

"'Hope thou in God.' Oh, remember this: There is never a time when we may not hope in God. Whatever our necessities, however great our difficulties, and though to all appearances help is impossible, yet our business is to hope in God, and it will be found that it is not in vain. In the Lord's own time help will come.

"Oh, the hundreds, yea, the thousands of times that I have found it thus within the past seventy years and four months!

"When it seemed impossible that help could, help did come; for God has His own resources. He is not confined. In ten thousand different ways, and at ten thousand different times God may help us.

"Our business is to spread our cases before the Lord, in childlike simplicity to pour out all our heart before God saying:

"'I do not deserve that Thou shouldst hear me and answer my request, but for the sake of my precious Lord Jesus; for His sake answer my prayer and give me grace quietly to wait till it please Thee to answer my prayer. For I believe Thou wilt do it in Thine own time and way.'

"'For I shall yet praise Him.' More prayer, more exercise of faith, more patient waiting, and the result will be blessing, abundant blessing. Thus have I found it many hundreds of times, and therefore I continually say to myself 'Hope thou in God.'"

About the time the depression started, several things like

bank failures and so on happened to me, in common with millions of better men and a maturing mortgage made it necessary to have before a certain date a large sum of money that was further out of sight than breakfast was for George Mueller's orphans that day they did not have it. God used a baker and a broken milk wagon to help Mueller and He used a poor old penniless drunkard to help me. At the time when there was absolutely no prospect of relief Dr. Charles G. Trumbull asked me to write a real cheerful Thanksgiving article for the *Sunday School Times*, which as an act of sort of defiant faith I sought to do. All of us "companions in tribulation and the glory that shall follow" in these days of war and food shortage need strong faith in God's faithfulness to His promises even more than we did in the days of depression and such food superabundance that we destroyed young pigs and burned corn and wheat (hard as it is to believe that we were ever such fools), and a verbatim quotation of the thing written in that earlier dark day may encourage us to hope for a deliverance from the present one:

Colored folks sing earnestly as they pass graveyards at night. For somewhat the same reason, possibly, back in 1930 I was whistling under my breath as I passed two of my banks, which had failed, toward a third where I had to renew a note: a situation gloomier than any graveyard!

"Don't you know that only morons whistle?" came to me from a person I knew only too well. "And that even a moron generally whistles something appropriate to the occasion?"

"I have read that many great men whistle," I answered. "And what's wrong with the tune?"

"Do you realize you still owe ten thousand dollars on that note—a debt-hater like you, who bought your home clear with a check; that your taxes are due, and you can't collect any rents; that your apartment house is nearly empty; and do you remember that sale you thanked God for, as an answer to prayer, clearing up everything for you, how it just turned out to be a good joke on you and how the property came back on your hands without even the taxes paid? What have you had but trouble for the last ten years? I've been giving *my* friends high times

while you have been going along, wasting this life thinking about a better one, and going out of your way to antagonize me. And you know what your boy's symptoms indicate, don't you? Peritonitis, that's what. I guess he'll die. And for years on end you have been hoping for 'a good end' for those things you asked God to guide you about, and resolving to 'wait patiently,' no matter how long. I've heard you claiming a promise, 'Commit thy way unto the Lord . . . and he shall bring it to pass' and saying to yourself, 'The Lord God will help me; therefore shall I not be confounded.' Just about confounded now, it seems to me! And you were fool enough to believe that those promises meant something real, weren't you? Ho! Ho! 'What doth it profit a man to serve Jehovah?' " And my companion " fell into a very great laughter."

"Yes, I remember all these things, and some a lot worse," I groaned.

"And here you are fooling yourself, and whistling 'I walk with the King, hallelujah!' I remember you had the callous bad taste to hum that on the way to the cemetery to have your father's grave opened."

"Yes," I interrupted, "and on that very trip I have some reason to believe the gas man and gravedigger were converted."

"*De gustibus non disputandum*," answered my companion, who dearly loves the use of Latin. "Your bad taste in tunes has more than once cost you my company. I have drawn near and heard you humming something about 'a fountain filled with blood,' and that somebody will 'hold me fast,' and will 'come again,' and 'my gorge has risen at you.' 'Hark! from the tombs a doleful sound,' is the song for you today! I'll sing bass with you."

"I have several reasons for not singing that," I said. "The first one is, I don't know the tune; second, that's not the kind of sound that's soon coming from the tombs I am interested in; and, third . . ."

"Your first reason is enough. The Devil, which is myself as you know, take the others."

"But the third is the best of all," I protested.

"I won't hear it."

"Since I am in for your company, 'O mine enemy,'" I

thought in my heart, "we may as well try to thrash this thing out and see if a rational man can really be thankful on this Thanksgiving Day."

So, when I returned to my office, I shut the office door and tried to pray and tried to think. Since a fight was on I encouraged myself a bit before, as Adolphus' men did by singing "Ein' Feste Burg" before the battle of Lutzen. The words that ran through my mind, though not exactly as the author wrote them, were:

Though hounded hard by mighty foes,
Though earth and hell my way oppose,
He safely guides my feet along,
His loving kindness, oh, how strong!

And that old Christian battle song, it seems to me, narrows down our thoughts at this Thanksgiving season to the one sufficient ground for rejoicing. "His loving kindness, oh, how strong!"

Strong enough to control the terrific forces tossing men and nations about as dust in the air! [This in 1929—how much more now in 1943.]

Strong enough and kind enough to give material help and spiritual cheer and courage to everyone who trusts it, and even to deliver our nation if it will, as a nation, repent and humble itself to ask the blessing that God will not otherwise humble Himself to bestow.

How thankful we Christians are that we know that there *is* a God, and that He "hath spoken" in the Bible, so that while the world is frantic with perplexity we know so exactly what is going on, and what is soon going to be, that we meet each other with cheerful countenances and merry words! We know a glad secret! "He is near, even at the door."

Even though we "are in heaviness through manifold temptations," our trouble after all is but superficial. The hopeless heartache of those who see their *only* world crumbling beneath their feet is a desperate sorrow that we do not share. "The lights are going out all over Europe," said one statesman. "Civilization is sinking under our feet," says H. G. Wells. But we know everything is happening exactly as foretold by

Him whose word comes to us, "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." Instead of hopeless anxiety we have tingling anticipations of early glory, bliss, reunion, romance, beauty, peace, "eternal life and joy."

And our faith, "rooted and grounded" in the certainty "of those things . . . believed among us" as to the past, is confirmed daily by the very things which convulse the world while they convince us that these divinely scheduled events are not just a distant mirage created by the heat of our desire—stage scenery with only a surface—but three-dimension realities soon to be matters of history, as certain shortly to come to pass as that the past events in the Bible *did* take place. We know that as surely as the prophecies *have* been fulfilled the promises embedded in the same book with them *will* be. And, when the fulfillment day by day of the events told by our Lord to presage His return are so overwhelming, certainly it is time for Christians to heed their Lord's words, "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up . . . for your redemption draweth nigh," and "lift up your heads," no matter how sadly we are "fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken." What greater cause for thanksgiving could there be than the very cataclysm which assures us that at last the Golden Age is at hand?

Of *course* Christians everywhere are in distressful circumstances! God has so indulgently supplied our earthly needs, and we have so long lived at peace in a "foreign land," that we have almost forgotten we are alien enemies in a country whose ruler is about to be overthrown, and whose wrath is great against the nationals of the coming, conquering Prince. God has so richly supplied us with *provisions* that we have not much needed the *promises*; we have had such a wealth of things that we have not much needed grace to bear a lack of them. Now we have a chance really to believe God and have it accounted to us for righteousness; to experience the thrill—greater than of the first man who felt himself pulled up into the air by a balloon—of being supported by God's Word. We can never know the joy of a deliverance manifestly miraculous because timed to the last moment when it would avail unless we stand the strain of

being brought to the very edge of the unfordable stream; come to the bottom of the meal barrel, with no other barrel anywhere. Many of us are having this experience now, and we should be thankful for it. Until we come to this point, God's promises are like life-preservers on a staunch steamer, something comforting to look at with the hope there will never be need to use them. But Christian living is incomplete until we have proved God's faithfulness, not in theory, but in actual and desperate need. A strong faith is a Christian's most priceless possession, and only in this way can it be had.

Whatever we may have lost during the last years, how thankful we can be that we have not lost our salvation! No sane Christian would, for a million dollars, return to his unsaved state for five minutes. In that period heaven might be lost forever. What we would not part with for a million is worth more than that to us; therefore, how rich we are! And we can be thankful for the good work our material losses have done for us in "root pruning" us, so to speak, for translation. The saintliest man is even more eager for the "voice of the Son of God" to call him away from distress than from peace and pleasure. "Ah, David, these are the things that make death terrible," said Samuel Johnson to David Garrick as the latter showed him his beautiful estate. When God is about to move His people, He finds ways to make them want to go. Pharaoh's persecution did it for the Jews in Egypt; Hitler is doing it for them now in Germany. The Stuarts did it for the Pilgrims in England. And the depression [and now the war] is doing it for Christians everywhere.

Many people, before they go on a long journey, feel a sort of faintness and sickness; many of us do now, and as we "walk by faith" and "endure hardness" we feel a dull heartache which is hard to bear. Paul evidently felt it so keenly that our ever-compassionate Lord sent an angel to strengthen him on the voyage to Rome. But these are faith's "growing pains." In prison "the iron entered into Joseph's soul"; and our hearts are being "ironized" and made strong enough to experience without rupture the "bliss beyond compare" which our natural frame could no more bear than Daniel could endure the bright presence of the angel Gabriel.

"How happy are tried Christians, afterward," writes Spurgeon. The old Vikings could not bear the thought of a "straw death," but wanted to die fighting. How humiliating to be summoned when we are buried in sloth and ease and carnal security! And what stronger joy could there be than to be called all bloody and scarred from fighting the King's battles into the King's presence!

We may find little cause for cheer in the "state of the nation," though the superabundance of our still undestroyed national wealth of food is an enormous ground for thanks to God, if we can only seek and get His grace for its distribution [how different our problem now!]; but as we pilgrims of the night see our "worldly gear" lost—*impedimenta*, the Romans called their baggage—we have the comforting assurance that this of itself indicates that our Lord knows we are so near the end of our journey that He is not bothering to renew our camping outfit. Maybe we have lost our home; but who is going to grieve over the destruction of his tent when his palace is in sight in the distance?

We read, "The word of the Lord tried him (Joseph)." Probably it has tried us hard during the past year. If, by His grace, we have stood the test, how happy we are! Who would not in retrospect rather look upon hardships endured than pleasures enjoyed? The first enrich our capacities for eternity; the latter but leave a layer of spiritual fat behind. The word of the Lord does indeed try us. We commit our ways unto Him, and our paths have been led ever into deeper peril and poverty. We are apt to forget that our heavenly guide and an earthly guide have different purposes. The one studies to give us an uneventful, safe journey. God is interested in the qualities we develop on the journey, not in the safety and softness of the trip. We expect to be guided wide of every danger, and He leads us over mountains and into impossible corners and through deep waters of trouble, and gets us to Heaven all breathless with excitement and exertion—but fitted for royal fellowship and capacitated for more "joy unspeakable and full of glory."

"The Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart," is a verse which has

often helped me in days past. He has seemed to be hearing my prayers backwards many a time; and this is the answer. We are told to make our boast in the Lord. Shall we not give Him the dearly loved opportunity to boast to Satan about us a bit, as He did about Job: to say, "You are not having much success with My servant George down there, are you?" When God can do this, though He has been giving our faith the hardest of all tests, "striking into it the dart of apparent desertion," I think we can know one thing the verse means which says His "delights were with the sons of men."

Do we want to be princes or pawns in the Kingdom to come?

Must we be carried to the skies on flowery beds of ease,
While others fought to win the prize, and sailed through bloody seas?

Next to not getting to Heaven would be to get there on a flowery bed of ease; to spend eternity without a scar on our whole rotund periphery as we consort there with the "lion faced men" who are the eternal and immediate courtiers of Prince Immanuel. If we find ourselves hard beset and longing for "His appearing" on this possibly last Thanksgiving day of the "twilight of our age," let us thank God and take courage. This is exactly the most blessed place and state to be in at this of all times.

My deliverance shortly after the above was written had evidently been planned fifteen years or more before it was needed, for it came about in this way:

William Biggs, before mentioned, the poor drunkard of whose conversion I told in a book published in 1929, after his conversion lived so sober and godly a life that his wife, who had divorced him forty years previously because of his utter worthlessness, took him back under her care and into her home. She was a most skilful business woman and financier and had accumulated a considerable fortune chiefly, she said, by doing the opposite of what her banker advisers told her to do in buying and selling stocks and bonds!

On one occasion when I responded to an appeal from Mr. Biggs to come to see him, as he was sick, I met Mrs. Biggs and she expressed herself most cordially toward me for what she

erroneously said I had done for her husband. Mr. Biggs soon after died, and a few years later Mrs. Biggs died also, and then it was that the bitterly fought contest over the validity of her will was instituted in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, as our upper court was then called.

Her brother and sister found that by her will the income from all her estate was left to them for as long as they lived but that after the death of the last of them it should pass to me. The brother and sister, whose judgment in business matters and ability to avoid loss of principal Mrs. Biggs seemed to consider less than her own, retained one of the ablest trial lawyers in Washington—a former Commissioner of the District of Columbia—to attack the validity of the will on the ground of the testatrix' mental incapacity and the "undue influence" which it was asserted my religious dealings with her husband had produced. Any lawyer will grasp in a moment the uncomfortable aspects of this situation. Mrs. Biggs had come to me to make and execute her will and stated she had no close friends and no relations and that after her brother and sister had been supported she wished to leave her entire estate to me. When I refused to draw her will to this import and sent her away to think it over she came back again, whereupon I sent her to another lawyer of high standing, through whom, in the presence of a Catholic priest who was then with him, the will was executed.

In the two or three times I had talked with Mrs. Biggs I had strongly urged upon her the abandonment of her Christian Science and adoption of the faith in Christ and the Bible which had done so much for her husband, and I have reason to hope that she had indeed turned from the heart-chilling, mind-numbing jargon of Christian Science to the strong and clear and comprehensible faith of the Christian.

When the case came to trial before one of our ablest judges, a devout Roman Catholic, and a jury in which I had reason to suspect there were both Jews and Christian Scientists, I remember talking with my wife about the hostile effect doubtless my testimony on the stand would produce in the minds of people of that faith; and the Devil whispered that as a lawyer I knew it would be fatal to antagonize a jury, especially about such a thing as religion, and that I had better speak of Mr. Biggs' conversion,

as I would be called upon to do, in general terms as a moral reformation, without bringing the name and action of Christ into the trial. "Dragging in the name of Christ" was the Devil's phrase. As soon as this thought entered my mind I recognized its source and told my wife that the case might be lost—in view of the violent prejudice likely to exist in the minds of any jury where a lawyer inherited rather than "the natural objects of a testatrix' bounty"—but that if I softened to the slightest degree my testimony in the matter I would feel utterly lost to honor and self-respect whether the case were lost or not.

As it turned out the best possible effect was produced by the categorical averment I made that I had indeed not only "talked religion" to Mr. Biggs but to Mrs. Biggs also on a couple of occasions—as I said I had as a matter of fact to my own Jewish friend and fellow lawyer who was acting as my attorney and sitting there before us at the counsel table and to more than one lawyer I saw in the court room—and then and there said that I made no apology for doing so but wished I might be the means of inducing any hearer to study the evidence which had led such men as Simon Greenleaf (a name to conjure with in any court) to utter assurance of the truth of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ. The full title was, I felt, as offensive as I could make it to Satan and as categorical an implication as I could make of my own faith.

In the course of the trial some lifelong friends and relatives of Mr. Biggs were put on the stand to testify about his utter degradation and the complete moral reformation he suddenly manifested "after he had talked with Mr. Linton," with the object, apparently, of demonstrating this happening as overwhelming Mrs. Biggs' mind with a mentally unbalancing gratitude. So it was that in an open court the thing I almost feared to write in the book which was introduced in evidence in the case about the sudden change from sodden drunken panhandling to God-honoring life and sobriety was under oath testified to and is a matter of court record for all time.

The jury returned a verdict upholding the will in spite of all the sarcastic things which any lawyer will readily recognize the situation made it possible for opposing counsel to say. The Roman Catholic judge after the trial said that "Mr. Linton's

testimony made a profound impression"; and through the years since more than one brother lawyer has told me that they still sometimes talk in the courthouse about the case and the successful boldness of the testimony given about so delicate a matter as a man's religion.

Though the life beneficiaries are still living and are the objects of a sincere prayer whenever they come to mind for long and happy lives, the commission as executor was sufficient to meet my need in the nick of time—and if the Lord will do that for a lawyer He will do it for anybody who trusts in Him. I am being facetious when I speak in this manner of the law, for with my knowledge of it, I testify that not only is it one of the noblest and most useful professions, but that its members are, as to the worthy majority, the most honorable class of men to be found in any profession.

And so was verified in my case Mueller's declaration:

"God has His own resources. He is not confined. In ten thousand different ways, and at ten thousand different times God may help us."

"The ways of the Lord are perfect"—but in this business of living, they certainly are oftentimes a strain on His children. So universally is this true that I think we may conclude that it is part of His plan and purpose that there should be this tension of faith, to make it stretch to its full growth—like a broken leg under the pull that assures perfect healing. We are in distress, we plead the promise, "Call upon me in the day of trouble. I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." And we call and, after it often seems almost intolerable delay and approach to the brink of disaster, He does answer and "deliver our souls from death, our eyes from tears and our feet from falling," and then we reflect how natural and right it is for a Christian "to be anxious for nothing" since the Lord will "keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed" on Him; but shortly there is another problem and distress and looming possible disaster! and our carnal hearts so long for a little restful walk by sight, as it seems to us it would be, for a change, to get the "kink" out of our spiritual backs, with no need to keep our faith under continual strain. When God sends His help He hides so perfectly as a rule behind second and intervening causes that the Devil

has little trouble insinuating his suggestion that "it just happened that way," and faith is almost as much exercised to believe God sent the answer as it was in the first place to pray down the answer from God. It is upon this point that the testimony of George Mueller is so valuable in bolstering our feeble "hearts of unbelief"; for his experience of last minute deliverances ran into the thousands during the "seventy years and four months" which had passed at the time he wrote what I quoted from his diary. And I think no man with the slightest knowledge of the law of compound probabilities will contend that there is room for the most infinitesimally small fraction of a chance even but that God did what was done.

And still life goes on, each day bringing new problems and trials to be carried to the throne of grace; and so it will continue until "journeying days are done" and we cross at last the threshold of our Father's House; but surely with the promises we have, the testimony of such men as George Mueller and the evidence that God helps not only such saints but poor, humble, unworthy lay sinners as we each doubtless and properly feel ourselves to be, the Devil should not be able to scare us any more with his reminders of the possibility of bombs dropping and of inflation and rationing starvation and growing infirmities, sickness and death. "My grace is sufficient for thee." "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." "In returning and in rest shall ye be saved. In quietness and confidence shall be your strength." "The Lord God will help me, therefore I shall not be confounded." So let us "put on the whole armor of God" and "be strong in the Lord and the power of his might," and "quit us like men" and "leap for joy" that we have such a glorious and meticulously faithful and considerate God, who gives us all things richly to enjoy here and has a heaven of unspeakable delight prepared to receive us the moment we are called away.

"With mercy and with judgment my web of time He wove,
And aye the dews of sorrow were lustered with His love.
I'll bless the hand that guided, I'll bless the heart that planned
When there where glory dwelleth, in Immanuel's land."

XV

THE BUSINESS OF DYING

IN examining the claims and contents of the Bible, we can verify the historic truthfulness of its records, the accuracy of its scientific statements and the detailed fulfillment of its prophecies. The divine wisdom of its rules for living our lives has been proven by the experiences of millions of men in both following and departing from them. The promises and undertakings it represents God as making to keep in personal contact throughout life with those who "lay hold on his covenant" and seek His guidance and help in all matters, such men as Hudson Taylor and George Mueller and others aver were made good to them through so many years, in such innumerable instances and unusual ways as afforded what we can see for ourselves is a mathematical demonstration that it was God who did the promising and performing to help His children in the business of living.

Up to the present time all of us have to depend upon the testimony of others as to God's help in the solemn "unfinished business" of dying; but this testimony is so abundant, various and specific that it can hardly mislead; and we can rest cheerfully in the assurance David expressed, "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death I will fear no evil for thou art with me."

Thoughts about dying are in youth and health much of the time easily put into the mind's background, as death seems a thing distant and almost theoretical. Now, however, the war has made death an even more imminent matter to youth than to age. But even under ordinary circumstances all but Christians young and old are "all their lifetime, through fear of death, subject to bondage." Those who know in saving faith Him who is "the faithful witness and first begotten from the dead," who has the "keys of hell and of death" have had largely removed from their hearts the almost infinite bitterness

of the sting of death and the desolating victory of the lonely grave. But the lengthening shadow of the tomb casts its chill over all unredeemed hearts. The "jitter-bug" dancing, the shrill singing, the frequent cocktails to lift flagging spirits out of the pit of gloom into which they are constantly sinking—all are pathetic proofs of the pall of sadness and despair shadowing human lives. The sense of the transitoriness of the present moment of pleasure chills every heart. Like a train seen approaching and receding from the beholder, but almost invisible at the flashing moment of passing, so the long anticipated and remembered experiences of life seem to crumble into the ashes of past and consumed joys even as we look at them and think how soon the happy honeymoon, the joyous family gathering at the Christmas banqueting table will fade out of reality into shadowy memories. When this thought comes there occurs sometimes an intimation of what is hidden in that great angelic proclamation to be made that "Time shall be no more"—only a blessed state of being.

How infinitely great our debt of gratitude to the Lord Jesus Christ who brought "life and immortality to light" and gave the element of *permanence* to joy is somewhat better grasped if we realize the Stygian darkness of hopeless Paganism. To this end it is well worth while to read every word of one of the greatest, most poignant of poems, "On Life and Death," by the great Latin poet Lucretius. It was to men at Rome, whose brightest hope was the "Gospel of the eternal death," that Lucretius proclaims, that Paul preached the Gospel of eternal life. No wonder that Priscilla and Andronicus and Amplias and Tryphena and Apelles "approved in Christ" "turned from darkness unto light and from the power of Satan unto God" as a result of Paul's preaching in Rome!

Imagine the darkness in the heart of Lucretius when he wrote the following lines:

1

The mind! Ay—there's the rub. The root is there
Of that one malady which all men share.
It gleams between the haggard lids of joy;
It burns a canker in the heart of care.

2

Within the gold bowl, when the feast is set,
It lurks. 'Tis bitter in the labourer's sweat.

Feed thou the starving, and thou bring'st it back—
Back to the starving, who alone forget.

3

Oh, you who under silken curtains lie,
And you whose only roof-tree is the sky,
What is the curse that blights your lives alike?
Not that you hate to live, but fear to die.

4

Fear is the poison. Wheresoe'er you go,
Out of the skies above, the clods below,
The sense thrills through you of some pitiless Power
Who scowls at once your father and your foe;

5

Who lets his children wander at their whim,
Choosing their road, as though not bound by him:
But all their life is rounded with a shade,
And every road goes down behind the rim;

6

And there behind the rim, the swift, the lame,
At different paces, but their end the same,
Into the dark shall one by one go down,
Where the great furnace shakes its hair of flame.

7

Oh, ye who cringe and cower before the throne
Of him whose heart is fire, whose hands are stone,
Who shall deliver you from this death in life—
Strike off your chains, and make your soul your own?

8

Come unto me all ye that labour. Ye
Whose souls are heavy-laden, come to me,
And I will lead you forth by streams that heal,
And feed you with the truth that sets men free.

9

Not from myself, poor souls with fear foredone,
Not from myself I have it, but from one
At whose approach the lamps of all the wise
Fade and go out like stars before the sun.

10

I am the messenger of one that saith
 His saving sentence through my humbler breath:
 And would you know his gospel's name, 'tis this—
 The healing gospel of the eternal death.

11

A teacher he, the latchet of whose shoe
 I am not worthy stooping to undo:
 And on your aching brows and weary eyes
 His saving sentence shall descend like dew.

12

For this is he that dared the almighty foe,
 Looked up, and struck the Olympian blow for blow,
 And dragged the phantom from his fancied skies—
 The Samian Sage—the first of those that know.

13

Him not the splintered lightnings, nor the roll
 Of thunders daunted. Undismayed, his soul
 Rose, and outsoared the thunder, plumbed the abyss,
 And scanned the wheeling worlds from pole to pole;

14

And from the abyss brought back for you and me
 The secret that alone can set men free.
 He showed us how the world and worlds began,
 And what things can, and what things cannot be.

15

And as I hear his clarion, I—I too
 See earth and heaven laid open to my view;
 And lo, from earth and heaven the curse is gone,
 And all the things that are, are born anew.

16

Vision divine! Far off in crystal air,
 What forms are these? The immortal Gods are there.
 Ay—but what Gods? Not those that trembling men
 Would bribe with offerings, and appease with prayer.

17

Far off they lie, where storm-winds never blow,
 Nor ever storm-cloud moves across the glow;
 Nor frost of winter nips them, nor their limbs
 Feel the white fluttering of one plume of snow.

18

At ease they dream, and make perpetual cheer
 Far off. From them we nothing have to fear,
 Nothing to hope. How should the calm ones hate?
 The tearless know the meaning of a tear?

19

We leave, we bless them, in their homes on high.
 No atheist is my master, he, nor I:
 But when I turn, and seek the stain of Hell
 Which flames and smokes along the nadir sky,

20

Even as I gaze the ancient shapes of ill
 Flicker and fade. From off the accursed hill
 The huge stone melts. The Ixionian wheel
 Rests, and the barkings of the hound are still.

21

The damned forbear to shriek, their wounds to bleed,
 The fires to torture, and the worm to feed;
 And stars are glittering through the rift, where once
 The stream went wailing 'twixt its leagues of reed;

22

At last we near the secret, oh my friend.
 Patience awhile! We soon shall reach the end—
 The gospel of the everlasting death.
 Incline your ear to reason, and attend.

23

DEATH is for us, then, nothing—a mere name
 For the mere noiseless ending of a flame.
 It hurts us not, for there is nothing left
 To hurt: and as of old, when Carthage came

24

To battle, we and ours felt nought at all,
 Nor quailed to see city and farm and stall
 Flare into dust, and all our homeless fields
 Trampled beneath the hordes of Hannibal,

25

But slumbered on and on, nor cared a jot,
 Deaf to the stress and tumult, though the lot
 Of things was doubtful, to which lords should fall
 The rule of all—but we, we heeded not—

26

So when the wedlock of the flesh and mind
Which makes us what we are, shall cease to bind,
And mind and flesh, being mind and flesh no more,
Powdered to dust go whistling down the wind.

27

Even as our past was shall our future be.
Others may start and tremble, but not we,
Though heaven with the disbanded dust of earth
Be dark, or earth be drowned beneath the sea.

28

Brother and friend, and art thou still averse
To tread that road? And will the way be worse
For thee than them? Dost thou disdain or fear
To tread the road of babes, and emperors?

29

Is life so sweet a thing, then, even for those
On whom it smiles in all its bravest shows?
See, in his marble hall the proud lord lies,
And seems to rest, but does not know repose.

30

"Bring me my chariot," to his slaves he cries.
The chariot comes. With thundering hoofs he flies—
Flies to his villa, where the calm arcades
Prophesy peace, and fountains cool the skies.

31

Vain are the calm arcades, the fountain's foam,
Vain the void solitude he calls a home.
"Bring me my chariot," like a hunted thing
He cries once more, and thunders back to Rome.

32

So each man strives to flee that secret foe
Which is himself. But move he swift or slow,
That Self, for ever punctual at his heels,
Never for one short hour will let him go.

33

Now, could he only teach his eyes to see
The things that can, the things that cannot be,
He would hail the road by which he shall at last
Escape the questing monster, and be free!

34

He shall escape it even by that same way
 On which fear whispers him 'twill turn to bay:
 For on that road the questing monster dies
 Like a man's shadow on a sunless day.

35

Brother and friend, this life brings joy and ease
 And love to some, to some the lack of these—
 Only the lack; to others tears and pain;
 But at the last it brings to all the peace

36

That passes understanding. Sweet, thrice sweet,
 This healing Gospel of the unplumbed retreat,
 Where, though not drinking, we shall no more thirst,
 And meeting not, shall no more wish to meet.

37

"Thy wife, thy home, the child that climbed thy knee
 Are sinking down like sails behind the sea."
 Breathe to the dying this; but breathe as well,
 "All love for these shall likewise pass from thee."

38

Brother, if I should watch their last light shine
 In those loved eyes, those dying ears of thine
 Should hear me murmur what, when my hour comes,
 I would some friend might murmur into mine.

39

Rest, rest, perturbed bosom—heart forlorn,
 With thoughts of ended joys, and evil borne,
 And—worse—of evil done: for they, like thee,
 Shall rest—those others thou hast made to mourn.

40

Even if there lurk behind some veil of sky
 The fabled Maker, the immortal Spy,
 Ready to torture each poor life he made,
 Thou canst do more than God can—thou canst die.

41

Will not the thunders of thy God be dumb
 When thou art deaf for ever? Can the Sum
 Of all things bruise what is not? Nay—take heart;
 For where thou goest, thither no God can come.

42

Rest, brother, rest. Have you done ill or well,
 Rest, rest. There is no God, no Gods, who dwell
 Crowned with avenging righteousness on high,
 Nor frowning ministers of their hate in Hell.

43

None shall accuse thee, none shall judge: for lo,
 Those others have forgotten long ago:
 And all thy sullied drifts of memory
 Shall lie as white, shall lie as cold as snow;

44

And no vain hungering for the joys of yore
 Gone with the vanished sunsets, nor the sore
 Torn in your heart by all the ills you did,
 Nor even the smart of those poor ills, you bore;

45

And no omnipotent wearer of a crown
 Of righteousness, nor fiend with branded frown
 Swart from the flame, shall break or reach your rest,
 Or stir your temples from the 'ternal down.

46

Flakes of the water, on the waters cease!
 Soul of the body, melt and sleep like these.
 Atoms to atoms—weariness to rest.
 Ashes to ashes—hopes and fears to peace!

So the poor pagan of long ago sought to benumb his agonized heart with the icy anesthesia of annihilation. The paganism of modern days is equally despairing.

The pessimism of Schopenhauer, Heine and Strauss have been thus summarized by Robert Flint, the great author of "Theism" and "Anti-Theistic Theories."

"In the enormous machine of the universe, amid the incessant whirl and hiss of its jagged iron wheels—amid the deafening crash of its ponderous stamps and hammers—in the midst of this terrific commotion, man, a helpless and defenceless creature, finds himself placed—not secure for a moment, that on some unguarded motion a wheel may not seize and rend him or a hammer crush him to powder. This sense of abandonment is at first very awful."

Flint's summary of Strauss' philosophy:

"It is an interminable succession of causes and effects, with no reason or love as either their beginning or end; it is an unlimited ocean of restlessness and change, the waves of which heave and moan, under the influence of necessity in darkness forevermore; it is an enormous mechanism, driving and grinding on of itself from age to age, but toward no goal and for no good."

Life is

"One desert
Barren and cold, on which the wild waves break,
But nothing rests, save carcasses and wrecks,
Rocks, and the salt-surf weeds of bitterness."

Byron writes:

"Count o'er the joys thine hours have seen,
Count o'er the days from anguish free
And know, whatever thou hast been,
'Tis something better not to be."

And Pierre Loti:

"Those who still bow before the feet of Christ know nothing of the anguish of passing time, the anguish of loneliness and the terror of coming extinction. They go on their way confident and calm. I would give my life to possess that radiant *illusion* of theirs, even at the risk of becoming as infatuated as the poor lunatics in asylums who fancy themselves among the rich and powerful of earth. In default of this faith could we but anchor ourselves to something, some hope, some immortality—but there is nothing. Outside of this ever shining personality of Christ everything is terror and darkness."

Lucretius asks "How should . . . the tearless know the meaning of a tear," but the Christian knows that "like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth those who fear him," and we read that in the days of His earth-life Christ's heart was so sensitive to even the in-a-moment-to-end grief of Mary and Martha that "Jesus wept." Lucretius writes of the poor, self-haunted Roman noble whose ". . . self, forever punctual at his heels, never for one short hour will let him go." He was not present in Rome when that Tarsus born Jew, Paul, came with his great message and exultingly cried "Therefore

being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." The best hope he held out to his despairing fellow Roman was the "gospel of the eternal death," that he would escape from the torment of being himself ("as I live saith the Lord, there is no rest to the wicked") "by that same way on which fear whispers him 'twill turn to bay: for on that road the questing monster dies like a man's shadow on a sunless day." Has utter despair and sorrow ever been more beautifully and poignantly expressed? His only comfort to a dying friend was not that "thy dead men shall rise"; that "they who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," not that if a man believe in the crucified Galilean "though he were dead yet shall he live"; he could not say with Job, "I know that my Redeemer liveth and that he shall stand in the latter days upon the earth, and though after my skin the worms destroy this body yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself and mine eyes shall behold and not another"; he had not had the unspeakable privilege such as had "Quartus a brother," probably one of Paul's Mamertine prison guards, of being chained to the Jewish prisoner until converted, so did not know that "now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept" and that "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." No, the only comfort he could offer was the benumbing chill of a "gospel" whose icy breath was colder than the damp of the tomb: that even the grief of memory—the poor thing which is all that death leaves us when a loved one dies—would also die. Not even grief would be left.

"Thy wife, thy home, the child that climbed thy knee
Are sinking down like sails behind the sea
Breathe to the dying this; but breathe as well
All love for these shall likewise pass from thee."

"Thou can'st do more than God can. Thou can'st die."

"And all thy sullied drifts of memory
Shall lie as white, shall lie as cold as snow."

"Eternal farewells, falling tears, fading flowers, silence,
night."¹

"Vale, vale, aeternum vale" on the Pagan tombs."

¹ B. H. Shadduck.

Before death all but the Christian is not only hopeless; he is utterly dumb! How radiant is the contrast of the moment after death for the Christian! "The souls of believers, made perfect in holiness, do at their death immediately pass into glory." "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, for they rest from their labors and their works do follow them."

"Valeria dormit"—on an early Christian tomb at Rome!

"I hae His gude word of promise that some gladsome day the King
To His ain royal palace all His banished hame shall bring
Where with hearts and eyes brimming o'er we shall see
The King in His beauty, in our ain countree.
Oh my sins hae been mony and my sorrows hae been sair
But there they'll never vex me nor be remembered mair.
His blude hae made me white, His hand shall wipe mine 'ee
When He brings us hame at last to our ain countree."

"In my father's house are many mansions."

"Jerusalem the Golden, with milk and honey blest
Beneath thy contemplation sink heart and voice oppressed
We know not, oh we know not what joys await us there
What radiancy of glory, what bliss beyond compare.

"They stand those walls of Zion, all jubilant with song
And bright with many an angel, and all the martyr throng
The Prince is ever in them, the daylight is serene
The pastures of the blessed are decked in glorious sheen

"There is the throne of David, and there from care released
The song of those who triumph, the shout of those who feast
And they who with their leader have conquered in the fight
Forever and forever are clad in robes of light."

What a contrast! "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift," by which "life and immortality are brought to light," "through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." Now the quiet tomb is merely a "chamber whose name is peace; and it opens toward the sunrising." And to think that the Christian's radiant future is not a "castle in Spain," merely the result of "wishful thinking," an "illusion" as Pierre Loti called it, but is as sure and real as is the present world we now live in—as sure as the facts set forth in the Bible really took place—which things the most famous members of the most

skeptical class of men in the world, that class which belongs to the profession which for centuries has studied and perfected the art and science of "separating truth from error," unite in declaring are so proven that a man has to "embrace manifest absurdities" and abandon the laws of evidence and reason to disbelieve them.

And from the medical profession come direct, scientific data which confirm the logical conclusion forced upon us by the rules of law and evidence. When about fifteen years ago I quoted a chapter from the book written by David Nelson, M.D., in which he tells of his observations at deathbeds, letters came to me from different parts of the country telling of personal observations similar to those recorded by Dr. Nelson. At page 299 of his book he writes:

"It does not seem a matter of moment where I begin in trying to present thoughts which passed through my mind while asking whether or not the Scriptures were of God. At different times and under various temperaments of soul I meditated on many points which made on me a lasting impression. Sometimes they spurred me on to further thought or to more industrious reading. . . . I shall begin by repeating a few of my thoughts on death.

"While attending medical lectures at Philadelphia I heard, from the lady with whom I boarded, an account of certain individuals who were dead to all appearance during the prevalence of the yellow fever in that city, and yet recovered. The fact that they saw, or fancied they saw, things in the world of spirits awakened my curiosity.

"She told me of one with whom she was acquainted who was so confident of his discoveries that he had seemingly thought of little else afterward, and it had then been twenty-four years. These things appeared philosophically strange to me for the following reasons.

"First, those who from bleeding or from any other cause reach a state of syncope or the ordinary fainting condition, think not at all, or are unable to remember any mental action. When they recover, it appears either that the mind was suspended or they were unable to recollect its operations. . . .

"Secondly, those who in approaching death reach the first state of insensibility and recover from it are unconscious of any mental activity, and have no thoughts which they can recall.

"Thirdly, if this is so, why then should those who had traveled farther into the land of death, and had sunk deeper into the condition of bodily inaction, when recovered, be conscious of mental action, and remember thoughts more vivid than ever had flashed across their souls in the health of boyhood, under a vernal sun and on a plain of flowers?

"After this I felt somewhat inclined to watch, when it became my business year after year to stand by the bed of death. That which I saw was not calculated to protract and deepen the slumbers of infidelity, but rather to dispose toward a degree of restlessness, or at least to further observation. I knew that the circle of stupor or insensibility, drawn around life and through which all either pass or seem to pass who go out of life, was urged by some to prove that the mind could not exist unless it be in connection with organized matter. For the same reason, others have contended that our souls must sleep until the morning of the resurrection, when we shall regain our bodies. That which I witnessed for myself pushed me, willing or unwilling, in a different direction. Before I relate these facts, I must offer something which may illustrate to a certain extent the thoughts toward which they pointed.

"If we were to stand on the edge of a very deep ditch or gulf, on the distant verge of which a curtain hangs which obstructs the view, we might feel a wish to know what is beyond it, or whether there is any light in that unseen land. Suppose we were to let down a ladder, protracted greatly in its length, and ask a bold adventurer to descend and make discoveries. He goes to the bottom and then returns, telling us that there he could see nothing; that all was total darkness. We might very naturally infer the absence of light there; but if we concluded that his powers of vision had been annihilated, or that there could surely be no light in the land beyond the curtain, because to reach that land a very dark ravine must be crossed, it would be weak reasoning; so much so that if it contented us we must be easily satisfied. It gave me pain to notice many, yea many physicians, who, on these very premises or on something equally weak, were quieting themselves in the deduction that the soul sees no more after death. Suppose this adventurer descends again and then ascends the other side so near the top that he can reach the curtain and slightly lift it. When he returns he tells us that his vision had been suspended *totally* as before; but that he went nearer the distant land, and it was revived again—that as the curtain was lifted, he saw brighter light than he had ever seen before. We would say to him, 'For a certain distance vision is suspended; but inaction is not loss of sight. Only travel on farther, and you will see again.' We can understand that anyone might go to the bottom of that ravine a thousand times—he might remain there for days, and, if he went no farther, he could tell on his return nothing of the unseen regions.

"Something like this was illustrated by the facts noted during many years' employment in the medical profession. A few cases may be taken as examples.

"I was called to see a female who departed under an influence which causes the patient to faint again and again, more and still more profoundly, until life is extinct. For the information of physicians, I mention, it was uterine hemorrhage from inseparably attached placenta.

When recovered from the first condition of syncope, she appeared as unconscious or as destitute of activity of spirit as others usually do. She sank again and revived; it was still the same. She fainted still more profoundly, and when awake again, she appeared as others usually do who have no thoughts which they can recall. At length she appeared entirely gone. It did seem as though the struggle was forever past. Her weeping relatives clasped their hands and exclaimed, 'She is dead!' but, unexpectedly, she waked once more, and glancing her eyes on one who sat near exclaimed, 'Oh, Sarah, I was at an entirely new place!' and then sank to remain insensible to the things of this world.

"Why she, like others in fainting, should have no thoughts which she could recall when not so near death as she afterward was when she had thought, I could not clearly explain. Why her greatest activity of mind appeared to happen during her nearest approach to the future world, and while so near that from that stage scarcely any ever return who once reach it, seemed somewhat perplexing to me. I remember that in the case recorded by Dr. Rush, where the man recovered who was to all appearance entirely dead, his activity of mind was unusual. He thought he heard and saw things unutterable. He did not know whether he was altogether dead or not. St. Paul says he was in a condition so near to death that he could not tell whether he was out of the body or not; but that he heard things unutterable. . . .

"The following fact took place in recent days. Similar occurrences impressed me during years of observation. In the city of St. Louis, a female departed who had a rich portion of the comforts of Christianity. It was after some kind of a spasm that was strong enough to have been the death struggle that she said in a whisper, being unable to speak louder, to her young pastor, 'I had a sight of home, and I saw my Saviour.'

"There were others who, after wading as far as that which seemed to be the middle of the river and returning thought they had seen a different world, and that they had had an antepast (foretaste) of hell. But these cases we pass over, and in the next chapter look at facts which point along the same road we have been traveling.

"I was surprised to find that the condition of mind in the case of those who were dying, and of those who only *thought* themselves dying, differed very widely. I had supposed that the joy or the grief of death originated from the fancy of the patient, one supposing himself very near to great happiness and the other expecting speedy suffering. My discoveries seemed to overturn this theory. Why should not the professor of religion who believes himself dying, when he really is not, rejoice as readily as when he *is* departing, if his joy is the offspring of expectation? Why should not the alarm of the scoffer who believes himself dying, and is not, be as uniform and decisive as when he is in the river, if it comes of fancied evil or cowardly terrors? The same question I asked myself again and again. I have no doubt there is some strange reason connected with our natural disrelish for truth

which causes so many physicians, after seeing such facts so often, never to observe them. During twenty years of observation, I found *the state of the soul belonging to the dying was uniformly and materially unlike that of those who only supposed themselves departing.*

"1. There was a man who believed himself converted, and his friends, judging from his walk, hoped with him. He was seized with disease, and believed himself within a few paces of the gate of futurity. He felt no joy, his mind was dark and his soul clouded. His exercises were painful and the opposite of every enjoyment. He was not dying. He recovered. He had not been in the death stream. After this he was taken again. He believed himself dying and he was not mistaken. All was peace, serenity, hope, triumph.

"2. There was a man who mocked at holy things. He became seriously diseased and supposed himself sinking into the death slumber. He was not frightened. His fortitude and composure were his pride and the boast of his friends. The undaunted firmness with which he could enter futurity was spoken of exultingly. It was a mistake. He was not in the condition of dissolution. His soul never had been on the line between two worlds. After this he was taken ill again. He supposed as before that he was entering the next state, and he really was; but his soul seemed to feel a different atmosphere. The horrors of these scenes have been often described and are often seen. I need not endeavor to picture such a departure here. The only difficulty in which I was thrown by such cases was, Why was he not thus agonized before, when he thought himself departing? Can it be possible that we can stand so precisely on the dividing line that the gale from both this and the coming world may blow upon our cheek? Can we have a taste of the exercises of the next territory before we enter it? When I attempted to account for this on the simple ground of bravery and cowardice I was met by two following facts.

"First, I have known those—the cases are not infrequent—who were brave, who had stood unflinchingly in battle's whirlpool. They had resolved never to disgrace their system of unbelief by a trembling death. They had called to Christians in a tone of resolve saying, 'I can die as coolly as you can.' I had seen those die from whom entire firmness might fairly be expected. I had heard groans, even if the teeth were clenched for fear of complaint, such as I never wish to hear again; and I had looked into countenances such as I hope never to see again.

"Again, I had seen cowards die. I had seen those depart who were naturally timid, who expected themselves to meet death with fright and alarm. I had heard such, as it were, sing before Jordan was half forded. I had seen faces where, pallid as they were, I beheld more celestial triumph than I had ever witnessed anywhere else. In that voice there was a sweetness and in that eye there was a glory which I never could have fancied in the death spasms, if I had not been near.

"The condition of the soul when the death stream is entered is not the same with that which it often becomes when it is almost passed.

The brave man who steps upon the ladder across the dark ravine, with eye undaunted and haughty spirit, changes fearfully in many cases, when he comes near enough to the curtain to lift it. The Christian who goes down the ladder pale and disconsolate oftentimes starts with exultation and tries to burst into song when almost across.

"Illustration. A revolutionary officer,¹ wounded at the battle of Germantown, was praised for his patriotism. The war ended but he continued still to fight, in a different way, under the banner of one whom he called the Captain of his salvation. The applause of man never made him too proud to talk of the Man of Calvary. The hurry of life's driving pursuits could not consume all his time or make him forget to kneel by the side of his consort in the circle of his children and anticipate a happy meeting in a more quiet clime.

"To abbreviate this history, his life was such that those who knew him believed, if anyone ever did die happily, this man would be one of that class. I saw him when the time arrived. He said to those around him: 'I am not as happy as I could wish, or as I had expected. I cannot say that I distrust my Saviour, for I know in whom I have believed; but I have not that pleasing readiness to depart which I had looked for.' This distressed his relatives beyond expression. His friends were greatly pained, for they had looked for triumph. His departure was very slow, and still his language was, 'I have no exhilaration or delightful readiness in my travel.' The weeping circle pressed around him. Another hour passed. His hands and his feet became entirely cold. The feeling of heart remained the same. Another hour passes, and his vision has grown dim, but the state of his soul is unchanged. His daughter seemed as though her body could not sustain her anguish of spirit, if her father should cross the valley before the cloud passed from his sun. Before his hearing vanished, she made an agreement with him that at any stage as he traveled on, if he had a discovery of advancing glory or a foretaste of heavenly delight, he should give her a certain token with his hand; his hands he could still move, cold as they were. She sat holding his hand hour after hour. In addition to his sight, his hearing at length failed. After a time he appeared almost unconscious of anything, and the obstructed breathing peculiar to death was advanced near its termination when he gave the token to his pale but now joyous daughter; and the expressive flash of exultation was seen to spread itself through the stiffening muscles of his face.

"When his child asked him to give a signal if he had any happy view of heavenly light, with the feelings and opinions I once owned I could have asked, 'Do you suppose that the increase of the death chill will add to his happiness? Are you to expect that as his eyesight leaves, and as his hearing becomes confused and his breathing convulsed, and as he sinks into that cold, fainting, sickening condition of pallid death, his exultation is to commence?'

¹ The writer, Dr. Nelson, was born in 1793 and died in 1844.

"*It did then commence.* Then is the time when many, who enter the dark valley cheerless, begin to see something that transports; but some are too low to tell of it, and their friends think they departed under a cloud when they really did not. It is at this stage of the journey that the enemy of God, who started with look of defiance and words of pride, seems to meet with that which alters his views and expectations; but he cannot tell it, for his tongue can no longer move."

Dr. Nelson gives additional illustrations from his own professional experience, and concludes this section of his book, which I have quoted as to this particularly unique though far from most interesting part, with the following words:

". . . these classes of fancies belonged to different classes of individuals, and *who they were* was the item which attracted my wonder. Such things are noticed by few, and remembered by almost none; but I am inclined to believe that if notes might be kept of such cases, volumes of interest might be formed.

"My last remark here, reader, is, that we necessarily speak somewhat in the dark of such matters, but you and I will know more shortly. Both of us will see and feel for ourselves where we cannot be mistaken, in the course of a very few months or years."

It was not many months after I quoted these words from Nelson that my own father, who was "sitting in the next room" as I wrote them, experienced the reality of these things, as Nelson remarks is the lot of us all; for he died on the very day after the great and courteous publishing house of Harper personally presented to me the first volume from their presses of the little book of which this is an hypertrophied revision, which I handed to him that he might see that it was dedicated to him. I am writing now in the offices where he practiced law for a good part of a half century. "Law Offices of Irwin B. Linton" is still on the door. "Irwin Breese Linton" is a name which since 1929 has been on a stone in Rock Creek Cemetery; but men still come into this office, as one of them remarked, to see if there still lingered any of the confident good cheer with which he always greeted and parted with those who came to see him. "A good time coming" was often his parting word. It has now come for him as it soon will for you and me, Christian reader, and for his dearest friend, law-school mate and early law partner, Joseph J. Darlington. If the united request they

agreed while in life they would make when they got to heaven has been granted, their mansions—or estates as the land-loving blood in me prefers to think of our heavenly inheritances—have contiguous boundaries.

When I telephoned Dr. Wallace Radcliffe, his former pastor, of my father's passing his inquiry at once was "Did he say anything?" evidently feeling that father was one of those most likely to be vouchsafed an opportunity such as some of Bunyan's pilgrims had to give a bit of information about the world just opening to their gaze to those who remained behind. Sick only four days with lobar pneumonia, before the discovery of the sulpha derivatives, contracted while following his favorite vigorous sport of rowing on the Potomac—the spirit left the body while it was under the effect of the sedative with which modern medicine eases the passage of most of us these days, and hence it is, I think, that the deathbed scenes of the past are no longer common.

But his distinguished physician, who also attended President Woodrow Wilson when he died, declared he felt it an honor to have met such a man even on his deathbed. He used almost his last conscious breath in making a courtly introduction of his daughter-in-law to this doctor—like the descendent of the long line of "gentlemen of the old school" that he was. It was during the last months of his life that he once said to me, "Son, my life has never been filled with such joy and buoyancy as now that I am near its end," and he used to sing sometimes the old Negro song: "Ain't Got Long to Stay Here."

His saddle horse—the last to be used in Washington for office travel—would stand unhitched all day at 14th and F Streets, the recipient of many pats and lumps of sugar. His diverse enthusiasms included organizing a bank, being commodore of a boat club and president of the Washington City Orphan Asylum and the Presbyterian Alliance of the District's churches, one of which he had nurtured to prominence after starting it as a mission. His zeal for rescue mission work was no whit abated by the theft of his watch as he kneeled one time beside a manifestly not yet converted penitent.

One of the city's oldest and most prominent inhabitants said

he believed his funeral was the largest of a private citizen in the history of Washington. The New York Avenue Presbyterian Church held only a part of those who attended, and the action of one of them—now in glory with him—as he passed the casket was most significant of the real triumph of a Christian's death. As he looked down at the countenance in the casket of the fallen knight of Prince Immanuel, his face broke into a wide smile as he glanced over at me.

Only the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ ever has or ever can wrest triumph from the very claws of the monster death and turn heart-crushing grief into the warm glow of joy with which those present sang:

"For all thy saints who from their labors rest,
Who Thee by faith before the world confessed,
Thy name Lord Jesus be forever blest,
Hallelujah, hallelujah.

"The golden evening brightens in the west,
Soon, soon to faithful warriors comes their rest.
Sweet is the calm of Paradise the blest,
Hallelujah, hallelujah.

Dr. Radcliffe conducted the funeral. At one time moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly, William J. Bryan said he would rather hear him pray than any other man preach (and how Calvinism does enable a man to pray!). As his last act in dying he lifted up his hands and pronounced the benediction—"May grace, mercy and peace"—"and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side."

All the muses ever invoked by Homer and Virgil together could not have inspired such stirring words as Bunyan put into the mouth of his dying pilgrim, Mr. Valiant-for-Truth, of whom my father and Mr. Darlington, about whose death I tell next, were such worthy successors:

"After this it was noised abroad that Mr. Valiant-for-Truth was sent for by a summons by the same post as the other, and had this for a token that the summons was true, 'That his pitcher was broken at the fountain' (Eccles. 12: 6). When he understood it, he called for his friends, and told them of it. Then said he, 'I am going to my Father's, and though with great difficulty I have got hither, yet now I

do not repent me of all the troubles I have been at to arrive where I am.

"My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it. My marks and scars I carry with me to be a witness for me that I have fought His battles who will now be my rewarder."

"When the day that he must go hence was come, many accompanied to the river-side, into which as he went he said, 'Death, where is thy sting?' And as he went down deeper, he said, 'Grave, where is thy victory?' So he passed over."

Pictures of these great Christian men whom I knew and loved well are presented with the question whether a besotted illusion, such as Christianity is if it is not the truth of God, could fashion human countenances into such lines of strength, intelligence and peace; and the challenge is extended to anyone to pick out the photographs of Darrow, Paine, Voltaire or any notable infidels they desire and see if they can find anyone who can make a mistake in picking out the Christians from the unbelievers. "There is a reason." "We, beholding his face as in a glass darkly, are transformed from image to image into his likeness."

The only lawyer in the nation's capital to whom a public monument has been erected—a European masterpiece of bronze casting of a young woman and fawn in the courthouse square—is Mr. Joseph J. Darlington. The manner of death of this great lawyer and great Christian is as unique and thrilling, I think, as any of which I have ever read. Think of a man whose faith was so sure and serene that he told funny stories and laughed on his deathbed:

Ex-President, Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, William Howard Taft is reported to have declared that he considered Mr. Darlington one of the three or four greatest lawyers in the nation's history—an opinion I have been told in which Chief Justice Edward Stewart White of the same court was in agreement. Mr. Alton B. Parker, one time candidate for the United States presidency and one of New York State's great justices, his opponent in prolonged litigation between the American Federation of Labor and the Buck's Stove and Range Company, stated to an associate in the course of this litigation

that he was the "ablest and most astute" man he had ever met in his life.

Mr. Darlington's devout Christian faith (like that of old Richard Henry Lee who, for his temerity in moving the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, was, with Washington, one of the only two men England said she would hang if possible, of whom Bishop Meade in his "Historic Churches and Families of Virginia" remarks that "He was a devout student of the Christian Evidences") had its foundation in a study of the Christian Evidences in his youth. The book on this subject written by Rev. Archibald Alexander, of Princeton, had been his introduction to the subject as Nelson's had been mine. In the course of his twoscore years of Bible class teaching he had cross-examined the Bible with a skill in this line that made a noted, condescending New York alienist who had been subjected to it later declare it had almost wrecked his health and ruined his reputation. He was the author of one of the best textbooks ever written on "Personal Property," the writing of which was a task he undertook to distract his grief immediately after the death of the wife he had married late in life and lost after only a few short years of happiness with her. After a life of incessant labor in the law, deliberately made the more unremitting to fill in the time until he should be reunited to the one woman he had ever loved, the time came for him to die. He was seventy-two years old, at the height of his mental ability and professional fame. Cancer of the stomach was found to have developed in incurable form, and was the token given him, in Bunyan's phrase, that "on this day six-month you must stand in the presence of the King."

After this sentence ending his earthly career was rendered—for while we all know our earthly career has an end, it is not until the end is fixed or in sight that it is regarded as having an end at all—he proceeded with his work without giving the slightest intimation to his closest friends, relatives, or associates of what impended. He tried some hard cases, quietly arranged his affairs, put all his various activities—especially those relating to church, missionary work, and the old Associate Reformed Presbyterian college before mentioned, which had given him his chance in life—into the best shape for continuing smoothly

after he was gone, and invited all his law associates and office force to his last birthday party.

At this birthday supper he was, of course, wished many happy returns, but his answer was that he had never wanted to get to be very old, and why should we want him to linger on down here when so much better times were waiting him elsewhere? He had not disclosed to any of us that this was to be his last birthday, and some of us assured him that we would feel as if about half the population of the world were gone when he went from us.

After a few more weeks he was unable to come to his office, so his clerks and stenographers went to his home, took his dictation, and from his cheerful, businesslike manner were of the impression that he would soon be back again. After a while he had to keep to his bed, and dictated his letters and briefs from there. About this time the word got out that Mr. Darlington was soon to die. To the lawyers of our bar the thought of his death was almost what the expected death of the Pope would be to all good Catholics if they knew they could never have another pope, and his bedroom daily had many lawyers in it seeking his advice and opinion. He grew constantly weaker, but always minimized his pain or "discomfort," as he called it.

One day the head of one of the National Baptist Mission Boards came from a distant state to see him and used the colloquial expression on entering his room, "Brother Darlington, I am sorry you are complaining." Quick as a flash the reply was, "I am not complaining, Dr. Gray." A verse he several times quoted to me was, "My Times Are in Thy Hand."

One day he got a letter from a devout teacher in his old college, which he deeply appreciated, but in which was a sentence whose import he quickly disclaimed. It was a remark to the effect that, to a man who had lived as he had, death would have neither terror nor regret. I brought him the letter, and he handed this portion to me and said: "Irwin, what does a good Presbyterian mean by writing to me like that?" He was referring to the fact that all his confidence rested in Christ's death and imputed righteousness.

To a noted brother lawyer who called to see him he told of

his desire to go on and end his journey here, and illustrated what his impending death meant to him. The other man was a Roman Catholic, with the terrifying prospect of purgatory between him and final heavenly bliss, and he marveled at him. The dying man told of an incident in his early married life, every word being in the incisive, terse manner which long years of court speaking had produced.

He said that one summer he had a peculiarly hard and protracted case to try. He sent his young wife away to a beautiful New England seashore resort, and during the hot, lonely, arduous weeks he toiled on. At last his case was done and won, and he was free to rest and rejoin the dear one, whom he was no more anxious to see at that time after four weeks' absence, than he was now after nearly forty years. He said at last the train came to the station, and as he got out of the car the fresh salt breeze filled his lungs, and his eyes rested on the lovely scene, the soul of which was his wife awaiting him, beautifully dressed and smiling her joy. The sun was setting behind the dark green pines and cedars and shedding glory on the "deep-voiced neighboring ocean," and the whole scene was one of utter beauty, peace, joy, rest—a foretaste of the rapturous reunion just a few days ahead with his loved one, when he would "see the King in his beauty, and behold the land that is very far off." That, he said, "is a slight intimation of what death means to me: the work done, the dust and weariness of this world far behind, the presence of loved ones and One above all others, amid scenes of beauty and glory such as our hearts cannot imagine." This story is known to practically every mature lawyer in Washington, and when my friend's name is mentioned men question whether his life or his death were the more glorious.

A few days before he died my wife, under whose grandfather he had graduated from college, went to take a last farewell, as it was known that he must now be kept under the influence of opiates until he died. Surely there have seldom been merrier scenes at a deathbed. Coming from the same little college town, there was an almost endless number of friends and incidents to talk about, and the conversation was all in happy vein. He told stories of her relatives and friends

and of his boyhood days in college, denying that he had installed the donkey one famous morning in the chapel, but admitting that he had provided the fodder for its comfort and nourishment until the faculty arrived. He laughed until the tears ran down his cheeks as he told this story and others.

After a while my wife said she must hurry home to look after supper, and they said good-bye. It was a tender good-bye, but one made cheerful and almost matter-of-fact by the invincible faith of this "good soldier of Jesus Christ" who only a few days later "put on immortality"—more like the parting of two friends for the night than the *Vale, vale, aeternum vale* which it would have been, as it was for the old Romans, but for the ten thousandfold established FACT of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

And this calm and confident passing through the valley of the shadow of death, from which so many of us shrink, was the result of the most exacting and searching consideration of the proofs of Christianity which one of the country's very greatest lawyers could give it. "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, but do speak forth words of truth and soberness."

So these two great lawyer Christians "'gladly lived and gladly died'" and "'laid them down with a will.'"

"Now while they were thus drawing toward the gate, behold a company of the heavenly host came out to meet them; to whom it was said by the other two Shining Ones, These are the men that have loved our Lord when they were in the world, and that have forsaken all for his holy name; and he hath sent us to fetch them, and we have brought them thus far on their desired journey, that they may go in and look their Redeemer in the face with joy. Then the heavenly host gave a great shout, saying, 'Blessed are they that are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb' (Rev. 19: 9).

* * * * *

"The talk they had with the Shining Ones was about the glory of the place; who told them that the beauty and glory of it was inexpressible. There, said they, is 'Mount Zion, the heavenly Jerusalem, the innumerable company of angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect' (Heb. 12: 22-24). You are going now, said they, to the paradise of God, wherein you shall see the tree of life, and eat of the never-fading fruits thereof; and when you come there you shall have white robes given you, and your walk and talk shall be every day with the King,

even all the days of eternity (Rev. 2: 7; 3: 4, 5; 22: 5). There you shall not see again such things as you saw when you were in the lower region upon the earth—to wit, sorrow, sickness, affliction and death: 'For the former things are passed away' (Isa. 65: 16, 17).

* * * * *

"There came out also at this time to meet them several of the King's trumpeters, clothed in white and shining raiment, who with melodious voices made even the heavens to echo with their sound. These trumpeters saluted Christian and his fellow with ten thousand welcomes from the world and this they did with shouting and sound of trumpet.

"This done they compassed them round on every side: some went before, some behind, and some on the right hand, some on the left (as it were to guard them through the upper regions), continually sounding as they went, with melodious noise, in notes on high; so that the very sight was to them that could behold it as if heaven itself was come down to meet them. Thus, therefore, they walked on together; and as they walked, ever and anon these trumpeters, even with joyful sound, would by mixing their music with looks and gestures still signify to Christian and his brother how welcome they were into their company, and with what gladness they came to meet them. And now were these two men, as it were, in heaven before they came at it, being swallowed up with the sight of angels and with hearing their melodious notes. Here also they had the city itself in view; and they thought they heard all the bells therein to ring, to welcome them thereto. But, above all, the warm and joyful thoughts that they had about their own dwelling there, with such company, and that forever and ever—oh, by what tongue or pen can their glorious joy be expressed! Thus they came up to the gate."¹

¹ Bunyan, "Pilgrim's Progress," pp. 161-3.

"Thy gardens and thy gallant walks continually are green
There bloom such sweet and pleasant flowers as no-where else are seen.
Right through the street with silver sound the living waters flow
Upon whose banks on either side the trees of life do grow."

XVI

"SUMMING UP"

A THREEFOLD ARGUMENT

AND now I wish to call attention, especially the attention of my fellow lawyers, to a consideration which seems to me of great weight, *i. e.*, that as those who have read thus far will note, there have been touched upon three independent and converging lines of proof of the divine origin and power of Christianity. Each, I submit, is conclusive in itself.

Let my reader face each one separately until he has conceived a rational answer to it or until his brain has forced his heart (for here is where the resistance lies) to accept this religion of peace, power, hope and happiness; let him consider fixedly the direct historical argument based on the blood-tested testimony of eyewitnesses to unmistakable facts, not "lying wonders" done in the shadows of dim cathedrals or temples in the presence of votaries eager to behold and believe a marvel in confirmation of a faith already held, but physical and physiological facts and changes in open fields, under the bright sun and in touching distance of the beholders. Let him remember that this was in attestation of a system of belief hostile to and subversive, as the beholders believed, of their Mosaic religion, and resulted not in confirming them in a faith and conduct already theirs, but in inducing them to abandon their present and adopt a new faith, a course of action which involved hardship, loss and death, and that these things were of such nature and done under such circumstances of unmistakable reality as would, it has been suggested in illustration, if done by the Pope of Rome in the presence of Protestants cause them to become convinced Roman Catholics and if done by the Moderator of the General Assembly at the Vatican induce the Pope and his cardinals to become devout Presbyterians. Let the reader consider this argument and then, if he can dispose of it, address himself to dissolving

the demonstration of the supernatural presented by prediction centuries in advance of detailed, dated, in many instances inherently improbable and, except in the case of the Jewish people dealt with, never in all history paralleled events, brought to pass in many cases by heathen kings and recorded by pagan historians; let him find the answer, which David Nelson the infidel physician could not, to the phenomenon of the uniform diversity of the experiences of dying saints and sinners; and then let him explain away the thousandfold testimony of drunkards and drug addicts who, calling on a certain Name—the identical and only Name, be it noted, presented in the Book—have found themselves to their own amazement and that of their despairing friends, completely delivered from the viselike grip of appetites which for years had enslaved them.

The three lines of proof I refer to may be designated for the purpose of considering the force each separately gives to the other, as the logical, historical, abstract demonstration of the supernatural source and power of Bible religion; the testimony of living men to the physiological and moral miracle of the cure of a drug habit; and the "dying declarations," opposite in nature but harmonious in effect, of both those who had accepted and those who had rejected this religion.

So strong an assurance of truth and sincerity accompanies the declarations of a man who truly believes he is then and there dying that the law admits such declarations as testimony even though to do so violates two major rules of the law of evidence: that against "hearsay" and the prohibition against testimony which has not been subjected to the test of cross-examination. The only cases here considered (though history supplies hundreds of others) are those observed by the infidel Dr. Nelson and recorded by the same man when the things he saw had impelled him to become a Christian. The fact that Dr. Nelson became a Christian does not weaken, but strengthens his testimony, just as the argument sought to be brought against the testimony of the early Church Fathers because of their Christianity has been turned against those making it by pointing out that the very fact that they embraced Christianity, with all the perils this entailed, gives tenfold force to their testimony to the

facts they testified to and which facts alone constitute an explanation for their conduct.

It is common practice to exclude from the courtroom all witnesses about to testify, so that each may give his testimony uncolored by that of any other. The dying declaration of every man is absolutely independent and isolated from that of every other dying man, for dying is something that each man does alone—though the Christian, of course, does not die alone but has then the best company he has ever had up to that time and a foretaste of the glorious companionship into which he is then about to enter for all eternity. As the senses are obscured, however, a dying man is certainly isolated from his fellow mortals, and it is obvious that there is neither inducement nor opportunity for a conspiracy to mislead in the testimony given as to glimpses into the other world. Those who read Dr. Nelson's report of the different attitudes of those who were really dying, and those who only thought they were dying, will find answered the only theory on which the validity of this testimony could be disputed. Now it appears that this corroborative line of proof is not only entirely different and independent from the theoretical proofs of our religion, but that every item in it is independent of every other; so there is the more significance that this whole line of proof and all its separate parts point to the identical conclusion supported by the logical argument that the religion of the Bible is true and does indeed fulfill the promises made in this world of bliss in the world to come for those who accept it. Would it not be strange if the reasoning of living men and experiences of dying men should unite in pointing to an error?

Then as to the corroborative force and independence of the testimony presented by the conversion and deliverance of drink and drug addicts, whose need is so great and whose vice is so subversive of freedom of will that God's grace meets this desperate exigency with a deliverance even from the temptation:

Each sinner is converted personally and individually, however many others may be "born again" at the same time, for one of the few experiences as solitary as that of dying is that of being born. The drunkard is tormented by the ulcers and burning in his own stomach, the "morphine fiend" by the agony in his

own nerves, and, as with the disease, so with the deliverance: he is freed in each case by a cure personal and confined to his own body and experience. It is well known that "long continued use of alcohol or morphine produces an abnormal condition of the stomach, nerves, and tissues which makes an instantaneous cessation of a drug craving physiologically impossible," as the doctor protested to Jerry McAuley when he testified about his conversion, and elicited the famous reply from McAuley: "Praise the Lord! I knew He had given me a new heart, but I didn't know He had given me a new stomach, too." The miraculousness and physiological reality of the conversion and instant cure of a drunkard or drug addict may be confirmed by the joint testimony of any medical authority and the wife or mother of any saved victim, whose instantaneous cure is as definite a violation of natural laws as would be the sudden reversal into an upward motion of the body of a man falling from an airplane. But such things have happened, and will happen again tonight in scores of rescue missions, as anyone interested may verify by going to see. When Jerry McAuley was asked how he knew he was converted, his answer was, "Bless you, I was there when it happened." When William Biggs was converted I was there when it happened; and years of contact with that saved brother afterward proved that it did indeed happen. All that was done then, and that is ever done, is to call on a certain Name. Of the Man who bore this Name we read in the Scripture that all power is given unto Him in heaven and on earth, and that "there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." By that Name men are and for centuries have been saved. Is it merely another coincidence that this Name alone of all the names of men and gods manifests this supernatural power?

It is a commonplace that while one thread of a three stranded rope may possibly be broken, the three strands twisted together and each multiplying the strength of the others may produce a tensile strength beyond the power to overcome. Does not this physical fact have a counterpart in the intellectual realm, and does not the convergence at one identical point of each of the three lines of proof we have considered, and of each item or thread in each strand, unite in forming a demonstration stronger

and more multiform than that supporting any other item of human knowledge, and, to vary the metaphor, by a sort of process of logical triangulation designate truth as the point at which every argument meets and at which every phenomenon is explained?

But with such evidences of the truth of Christianity—not the Modernistic religion of this name which is as far from being the Gospel as a formless cubist picture is from the art of Raphael, or the incoherent, demoniac sounds of the modernist jazz composer is from law-abiding music—the religion of Paul and Luther and the Fundamentalists of all ages, with what awful care should every man approach it and test his reasons for incurring the risk of rejecting it! “How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?”

As I started these chapters with an appeal to my fellow lawyers to examine the case for the Bible just as they would any important matter submitted to their professional attention by a client, now I beg that they will if and when converted become “of counsel” for Prince Immanuel in His age-long litigation and warfare with Satan, the “Prince of this world” who has seduced countless millions of God’s creatures to renounce His sovereignty and become subjects and servants of himself. Our “Sovereign Lord and King” undertakes to reward those who serve Him more richly than did William of Normandy in giving whole provinces of England to the barons who helped him conquer it, even rulership of portions of the mighty empire of the “only Potentate, King of kings and Lord of lords.”¹

The “lists are open”; the great tournament is on. “Who is on the Lord’s side?” Who is “king’s champion”? As the old recruiting sergeant of the War between the States is reported to have said: “Fall in, gentlemen, there is good fighting all up and down the line.” “Learned Brother,” go to your nearest really evangelical church and tell the pastor that all your talents and training as a lawyer are at his service to help him proclaim Christ’s Gospel.

What worthier task can any of us undertake than with un-

¹ “Well done, good and faithful servant. Be thou ruler over five cities”—five constellations?

flagging zeal, to bring to the attention of our fellow men the certainty of the unspeakably glad tidings that, however sin and sorrow have burdened the life, there is "life for a look at the Crucified One"; forgiveness for every conceivable sin and crime; God's infinite love and blessing to be had for the asking IN CHRIST'S NAME; His help in every trouble and problem of this life and unspeakable felicity in His heaven as soon as death closes our eyes here?

And my appeal to any unsaved man or woman, lawyer or layman, is first that you will try the quick and infallible remedy for infidelity and infelicity of which David Nelson writes and of which William Biggs availed himself with such immediate, wonderful, permanent and court-recorded results. Go apart and on the bended knees appropriate in addressing the Great King confess every remembered sin, ask for its pardon in the name of the Christ whom you tell this King you gratefully accept as your substitute and atonement, with the avowal of your belief that he did indeed rise from the dead after dying for you and other sinners in like case, swear your fealty to him as the "Lord from Heaven" and undertake, by God's grace, to walk in His good ways and observe his holy and blessed laws and statutes.

If you will not do this forthwith, though I trust indeed you may, will you follow the plan commended by Dr. Ruben A. Torrey to the "up and outs" among lawyers, bankers and business men who were the especial objects of his ministry: Pray, "Oh God, if there be a god (assuming you are not even sure of this and are unwilling to commit yourself so far), show me what to believe about Jesus Christ, and if you show me He is your divine Son and my Saviour, I will gladly accept and confess him." Then, with this prayer on your lips and continually in your heart to the Holy Spirit to illuminate you as you read, read the whole Gospel of St. John—at one sitting if possible—and do as the sovereign Lord may be gracious enough to move you to do when you have finished. Dr. Torrey stated that he had known many men who followed this course with the most complete "unexpectedness" of anything happening, who were amazed and enraptured by the resulting flood of light, faith and joy that came to them with real conversion.

If you are already a Christian may I suggest a third course?

One of our hymns asks God if we should "ever live at this poor, dying rate," and the ministry of my beloved deceased brother Dr. Charles G. Trumbull and of the great conferences held at Keswick, New Jersey, and Keswick in Canada and at Keswick in England for example is to help us poor, defeated, sin-sorrowed, joyless, fruitless Christians to possess our possessions in Christ by making that complete "surrender" to the benevolent and "love-to-the-death" sway of the Lord Jesus Christ which is our "reasonable service" and which, like the bride's complete giving of herself in the marriage ceremony to her lover, makes him such a complete "covering to the eyes" and part of herself that she becomes a new being. The necessity for this act of complete giving of oneself, in return for the tendered complete reciprocal giving of Christ by Himself to us, has been explained by many devout writers and exemplified by many lives transformed by the act.

A thing which seemed to lie at the heart of this matter, as messages and testimonials were once given at Keswick, New Jersey, was the question how to make this act of dedication so definite and complete that afterward Satan and our hearts which are "deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked" could not tell us "there was no reality in that time you bowed your head while someone prayed and you said certain words of dedication in your heart." Dr. Trumbull once told of an old colored man who, taunted by the devil with the question why he thought he had really surrendered to God, adopted the plan of driving a stake into the ground as a memorial, and thereafter told the devil he had indeed given himself to Christ and there was that stake to witness it. It occurred to me that there was a better way, and while on the way home from Keswick, waiting in the station at Camden one time, I wrote off a form of deed which I hurriedly mailed back to Dr. Trumbull and which he had printed and used all over the country in his speaking tours. A copy of this deed appears at the end of this book. If signed and executed as indicated one may be sure that he has made as good a conveyance of himself as the law knows how to provide, and it may, under God, be the means of giving assurance that we have in good faith "laid hold on God's covenant" in as solemn and formal a manner as a written act and deed can do it.

And may the

"God of peace who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant"

fill all our hearts "with joy and peace in believing," and enable us to "witness a good confession" of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ "till he come."

"Now blessed be the Lord our God
The God of Israel,
For He alone doth wondrous works
In glory that excel,

"And blessed be His Holy Name
Through all eternity
And may the earth His glory fill.
Amen it so shall be."

APPENDIX "A"

"THE COMING PRINCE"

By Sir Robert Anderson

The following is from Chapter X of "The Coming Prince," by Sir Robert Anderson, and is quoted for the purpose of illustrating an exactly fulfilled prophecy and the care with which this Christian lawyer examined the Bible.

" 'The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children' (Deut. 29: 29). And among the 'things which are revealed,' fulfilled prophecy has a foremost place. In presence of the events in which it has been accomplished, its meaning lies upon the surface. . . . The writings of Daniel have been more the object of hostile criticism than any other portion of the Scripture, and the closing verses of the ninth chapter have always been a principal point of attack. And necessarily so, for if that single passage can be proved to be a prophecy it establishes the character of the book as a Divine revelation."

The words of Daniel with which Sir Robert Anderson here deals are the following (Daniel 9):

"Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression and to make an end of sins and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy and anoint the most Holy.

"Know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again and the wall even in troublous times.

"And after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself . . ."

Resuming the quotation from "The Coming Prince":

"The sceptre of earthly power which was entrusted to the house of David was transferred to the Gentiles in the person of Nebuchadnezzar, to remain in Gentile hands 'until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.'

"The blessings promised to Judah and Jerusalem were postponed till after a period described as 'seventy weeks'; and at the close of the sixty-ninth week of this era the Messiah should be 'cut off.'

"These seventy weeks represent seventy times seven prophetic years of 360 days, to be reckoned from the issuing of the edict for the rebuilding of the city—the street and rampart of Jerusalem.

"The edict in question was the decree issued by Artaxerxes Longimanus in the twentieth year of his reign, authorizing Nehemiah to rebuild the fortifications of Jerusalem.

"The date of Artaxerxes' reign can be definitely ascertained—not from elaborate disquisitions by Biblical commentators and prophetic writers, but by the united voice of secular historians and chronologers.

"The statement of St. Luke is explicit and unequivocal, that our Lord's public ministry began in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar. It is equally clear that it began shortly before the Passover. The date of it can thus be fixed as between August A. D. 28 and April A. D. 29. The Passover of the crucifixion therefore was in A. D. 32, when Christ was betrayed on the night of the Paschal Supper, and put to death on the day of the Paschal Feast.

"If then the foregoing conclusions be well founded we should expect to find that the period intervening between the edict of Artaxerxes and the Passion was 483 prophetic years. And accuracy as absolute as the nature of the case permits is no more than men are here entitled to demand. There can be no loose reckoning in a Divine chronology; and if God has deigned to mark on human calendars the fulfillment of His purposes as foretold in prophecy, the strictest scrutiny shall fail to detect miscalculation or mistake.

"The Persian edict which restored the autonomy of Judah was issued in the Jewish month Nisan. It may in fact have been dated the 1st Nisan, but no other date being named, the prophetic period must be reckoned, according to a practice common with the Jews, from the Jewish New Year's Day.¹ The seventy weeks are therefore to be computed from the 1st Nisan B. C. 445.

"Now the great characteristic of the Jewish sacred year has remained unchanged ever since the memorable night when the equinoctial moon beamed down upon the huts of Israel in Egypt, bloodstained by the Paschal sacrifice; and there is neither doubt nor difficulty in fixing within narrow limits the Julian date of the 1st of Nisan in any year whatever. In B. C. 445 the new moon by which the Passover was regulated was on the 13th of March at 7h. 9m. A. M.² And accordingly the 1st Nisan may be assigned to the 14th March.

"But the language of prophecy is clear: 'From the going forth of the

¹ "On the 1st of Nisan is a new year for the computation of the reign of kings and for festivals."—Misha, treatise "Rosh Hash."

² For this calculation I am indebted to the courtesy of the Astronomer Royal, whose reply to my inquiry on the subject is appended:

"Royal Observatory, Greenwich.
June 26th, 1877.

"Sir:—

I have had the moon's place calculated from Largeteau's Tables in *Additions to the Connaissance des Temps* 1846, by one of my assistants, and have no doubt of its correctness. The place being calculated for 444, March 12d, 20h, French reckoning, or March 12d. 8h. p. m., it appears that the said time was short of New Moon by about 8h. 47m., and therefore the New Moon occurred at 4h. 47m. A. M., March 13th, Paris time.

"I am, etc.,

"(Signed) G. B. AIRY."

"The new moon, therefore, occurred at Jerusalem on the 13th March, B. C. 445 (444 Astronomical) at 7h. 9 m. A. M."

commandment to restore and build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks.' An era therefore of sixty-nine 'weeks' or 483 prophetic years reckoned from the 14th March B. C. 445 should close with some event to satisfy the words 'unto Messiah the Prince.'

* * * * *

"No student of the gospel narrative can fail to see that the Lord's last visit to Jerusalem was not only in fact, but in the purpose of it, the crisis of His ministry, the goal toward which it had been directed. After the first tokens had been given that the nation would reject His Messianic claims, He had shunned all public recognition of them. But now the twofold testimony of His words and His works had been fully rendered, and His entry into the Holy City was to proclaim His Messiahship and to receive His doom. Again and again His apostles even had been charged that they should not make Him known. But now He accepted the acclamations of the 'whole multitude of the disciples,' and silenced the remonstrance of the Pharisees with the indignant rebuke, 'I tell you if these should hold their peace the stone would immediately cry out.' . . .

"The time of Jerusalem's visitation had come, and she knew it not. Long ere then the nation had rejected Him, but this was the predestined day when their choice must be irrevocable;—the day so distinctly signified in Scripture as the fulfillment of Zechariah's prophecy, 'Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion! shout, O daughter of Jerusalem! behold thy King cometh unto thee.' Of all the days of the ministry of Christ upon earth, no other will satisfy so well the angel's words 'unto Messiah the Prince.'

"And the date of it can be ascertained. In accordance with the Jewish custom, the Lord went up to Jerusalem on the 8th Nisan, 'six days before the Passover.'¹ But as the 14th, on which the Paschal Supper was eaten, fell that year upon a Thursday, the 8th was the preceding Friday. He must have spent the Sabbath, therefore, at Bethany; and on the evening of the 9th, after the Sabbath had ended, the Supper took place in Martha's house. Upon the following day, the 10th Nisan, He entered Jerusalem as recorded in the Gospels (Lewin, "Fasti Sacri," p. 230).

"The Julian date of that 10th Nisan was Sunday the 6th April, A. D. 32. What then was the length of the period intervening between the issuing of the decree to rebuild Jerusalem and the public advent of 'Messiah the Prince'—between the 14th March, B. C. 445, and the 6th April, A. D. 32?

¹ "When the people were come in great crowds to the feast of unleavened bread on the eighth day of the month Xanthicus," *i. e.* Nisan (Josephus, Wars, vi: 5, 3).

"And the Jews' Passover was nigh at hand, and many went out of the country up to Jerusalem, before the Passover, to purify themselves. . . . Then Jesus, six days before the Passover, came to Bethany" (John 11: 55; 12: 1).

"THE INTERVAL CONTAINED EXACTLY AND TO THE VERY DAY 173,880 DAYS, OR SEVEN TIMES SIXTY-NINE PROPHETIC YEARS OF 360 DAYS, the first sixty-nine weeks of Gabriel's prophecy.¹

"Much there is in Holy Writ which unbelief may value and revere, while utterly refusing to accept it as Divine; but prophecy admits of no half faith. The prediction of the 'seventy weeks' was either a gross and impious imposture, or else it was in the fullest and strictest sense God-breathed (ΤΕΟΠΝΕΟΥΣΤΟΣ, 2 Tim. 3: 16). . . . To believe that the facts and figures here detailed amount to nothing more than happy coincidences involves a greater exercise of faith than that of the Christian who accepts the book of Daniel as divine. There is a point beyond which unbelief is impossible, and the mind in refusing truth must needs take refuge in a misbelief which is sheer credulity."

¹ "The 1st Nisan in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes (the edict to rebuild Jerusalem) was 14th March B. C. 445.

"The 10th Nisan in Passion Week (Christ's entry into Jerusalem) was 6th April, A. D. 32.

"The intervening period was 476 years and 24 days (the days being reckoned inclusively, as required by the prophecy, and in accordance with Jewish practice).

"But $476 \times 365 =$	173,740 days
Add (14th March to 6th April, both inclusive)	24 days
Add for leap years	116 days

	173,880 days
And 69 weeks of prophetic years of 360 days (or $69 \times 7 \times 360$) =	173,880 days.

"It may be well here to offer two explanatory remarks: First: in reckoning years from B. C. to A. D. one year must always be omitted; for it is obvious, ex. gr., that from B. C. 1 to A. D. 1 was not two years, but one year. B. C. 1 ought to be described as B. C. 0, and it is so reckoned by astronomers, who would describe the historical date B. C. 445 as 444 (see note p. 124 ante). And secondly, the Julian year is 11m. 10. 46s., or about the 129th part of a day longer than the mean solar year. The Julian calendar, therefore, contains three leap years too many in four centuries, an error which had amounted to eleven days in A. D. 1752, when our English calendar was corrected by declaring the 3rd September to be the 14th September, and by introducing the Gregorian reform which reckons three secular years out of four as common years: ex. gr., 1700, 1800 and 1900 are common years, and 2000 is a leap year. 'Old Christmas day' is still marked on our calendars, and observed in some localities, on the 6th of January: and to this day the calendar remains uncorrected in Russia."

APPENDIX " B "

"THE DIVINE HUMAN IN THE SCRIPTURES"

(p. 7 et seq.)

By Tayler Lewis

" No book is so purely human as the Bible; there is no one in which the actors are so purely men. Its language, idioms, figures, are all addressed to our most intense, and therefore most universal humanity. This is proof of its divinity. Nothing but an inspiration in the human, breathing through it, penetrating and sounding every part of it, could have so brought out the human. Its language, therefore, whilst most intensely ours, is, of all language, the most divine. The philosophic or scientific styles of speech would have betrayed their purely earthly origin by their partial, their one-sided, and therefore false anthropopathism; for it would have been anthropopathism still, though not the divine anthropopathism of the Scriptures. The very attempt to get above humanity would have produced a distorted and inhuman representation. The Scriptures, like Christ, come down to us—come down to us *perfectly*; they occupy the common plane of our nature. Hence their language, if inspired at all, is inspired throughout. The very words and figures are full of the divine breath, and are therefore to be searched for the divine thought, the divine emotion, that fills out this perfect humanity.

" It might have been written on the sky, or, what would have been very much the same thing, by men employed, not as thinking, feeling, conceiving, in all their freedom as men, but as outwardly moved, as amanuenses or involuntary utterers. But this would not have been *our* Scriptures, our revelation, our most human as well as most divine book. It would not have been an inspiration *in* the human, and *through* the human. Its thought must link itself with our thought, its emotion with our emotion, as light from light, and life from life. Through the divine "o'ershadowing" power it is conceived in human feeling, nurtured in human thinking, fashioned in human language. Thus, as ultimate products, and through this linked series of generation, the very words are inspired, not merely the thoughts or emotions, as though these could be separated from the words. For how can there be feelings that do not fashion to themselves images, and how can there be images in the mind that do not arrange themselves in thoughts and how can there be thoughts that do not take the form of words! The process is inseparable. The first inspiration, in inbreathing, has in it, not only virtually, but in design, all the rest. Thus the very words of Scripture are inspired. This is the great truth, the living truth, that forms the only basis of any hopeful interpretation. The language is what God

meant it to be. It is His chosen method, His best method, for revealing Himself to human minds. As the Infinite must be unknown, unthought, or clothe Himself in the forms of the finite, so this is the form He has selected as the most human, the most perfect in its finiteness. He has taken this rather than the style of science and philosophy, even as Christ came in the purest and most universal humanity instead of that false anthropomorphism that might have been preferred by the more ambitious forms of human thought. Our philosophy may not like the word; there is none, perhaps, to which the common irreligious thinking affects to be more opposed; but we cannot escape from the thing itself; and why should we wish to escape from it? All religion, all revelation, is a divine anthropopathism. No other is conceivable. The Written Word, the Incarnate Word, however we may regard them as differing in rank, are analogous manifestations of the same condescension in the Infinite and Ineffable Personality."

APPENDIX "C"

A LAWYER QUESTIONS AN ATHEIST

"MY dear Mr. Lewis:

"Some time ago I received a folder urging me to buy your book, 'The Bible Unmasked,' and, as it appears to deal with one phase of a subject in which I have been interested for many years, I read the table of contents carefully.

"The immoral and contemptible incidents which you make the basis of your argument are indeed in the Bible, as I know from personal knowledge. In fact, they are so well known that I rather doubt whether there be many whom the statement of your circular will fit, where it mentions 'Strange facts about the Bible you never knew before,' except possibly among almost illiterate people. The facts are beyond dispute. *May I ask the benefit of a statement of your view as to the inference to be drawn from them?*

"If the logic of your book is as sound as the basic facts from which you reason are true, I want a copy. I have in the last twenty-five years of my study of this general subject, however, so invariably found in the works of Paine and Voltaire and Ingersoll and other famous infidel writers even from the time of Celsus, two thousand years ago, either a fatal inaccuracy in the data or a fatal flaw in the logic employed, that to avoid waste of time by a repetition of this experience I would be grateful for a short, syllogistic statement of the line of reasoning you follow from the facts so accurately referred to. Of course we both know that illogical reasoning even from true facts is as valueless as sound reasoning from erroneous data; and as it would require only a few sentences to outline your argument, I would be grateful for the information asked.

BIOGRAPHIES THAT TELL THE TRUTH

"A thing which has impressed me as quite remarkable about the Bible is that the writers should have set down so mercilessly the discreditable things you mention about the great Jewish national heroes. All other histories with which I am familiar gloss over the faults and magnify the virtues and exploits of their patriots. Looked at merely as history, the facts you mention indicate to my mind that the Bible is to be highly regarded because of this, and the candor of the Jewish writers much to be admired. Also, it seems to me the incidents sound very true to life as it was in ancient days—and now, if the newspapers are to be believed at all; and if such things were not related about the men of long ago I, for one, would be strongly inclined to consider the Bible not a

true but a 'whitewashed' record of the Jewish race. Do you not think with me about this?

"As to the New Testament, some scholarly writers I have read have stated that the candor of the writers of the Gospels in setting down their own cowardice, selfishness, and desertion of their leader is a phenomenon unique in literature. Have you run across anything like it in the course of your reading?

"But I surmise that your argument must be that a book in which is recorded Abraham's cowardly concealment of his relationship to his wife, Lot's drunken crime, David's adultery with Bathsheba, and such things cannot be the inspired 'Word of God,' as Christians call it, since the Christian God is alleged to be a Holy Being, who abhors and turns into hell unrepentant sinners who act as these men did; in other words, that, on the Christians' own theory, if God had inspired or supervised the writing of a book at all He would have seen to it that it contained only stories of human goodness and purity.

"If the Bible did this, however, the Christians would be in a logical dilemma in trying to maintain the divine inspiration of the Bible, for the God they worship is supposed to be all-wise and all-knowing, and even we know that perfectly pure and good and noble beings have never yet lived on earth among us. There would be this further advantage to be had in attacking the Bible if it did not relate such things as you refer to: *i. e.*, that it would be inconsistent with itself, for it declares again and again that the human race and every member of it is desperately sinful and prone to such offenses as are recorded. 'The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked,' is one statement of the Bible. 'All have sinned,' is another. In view of this clear and reiterated declaration of the Bible and its harmony with the facts as we know them, I am at a loss to know how to use the things you refer to in an argument to prove that the God Who is alleged to know all things did not write a book which sets forth facts entirely consistent with truth and with itself.

SHOWING SIN IN ITS TRUE LIGHT

"Now if the Bible stated that mankind is a pure and holy and noble race, and then we found such incidents as part of human history recorded in it, it seems to me the believers in the inspiration of this Book would have a hard time justifying their faith. But, unfortunately for the argument against the Bible, the thing is just the opposite, and we are assured that the Bible is a record of a desperately wicked race which is being dealt with by a holy and rigorously just but also merciful and forgiving God. The Bible declares that mankind is so sinful and utterly depraved that it needs a Saviour, and the facts recorded to which you refer seem to afford strong proof that this statement is true, and that even men ordinarily distinguished above their contemporaries for probity and benevolence occasionally fell into sins almost as contemptible as those indulged in by people today. When the history fits

the theory of the religion as here, I am at a loss how to use this correspondence as an argument against divine authorship for the Bible. What is your method?

"A thing which impresses me deeply in this connection is the basic consistency of God's alleged dealings with both repentant and unrepentant sinners, and the admirable qualities attributed to Him both in His judgments and His pardons. His delayed and reluctant, even if finally inflexible, execution of righteous judgment upon men and nations who would not turn from their evil ways, and the apparently eager quickness of His pardon and mercy to those who did repent,—as illustrated by His dealings with David when he confessed his sin, and the city of Nineveh when it repented in 'sackcloth and ashes,'—appeal to both my mind and my heart as presenting a Being admirably qualified for the difficult task of governing the universe in righteousness and mercy.

"But leaving this phase of the matter, may I ask your good offices in liberating me from the constraining effect on my mind which the following briefly outlined considerations have upon it? If you can point out to me any error or fallacy of logic you will be rendering me a real service, as my religious convictions, arrived at in the first instance entirely on logical grounds, have for many years had a very constraining influence on my life, and I would not like to forego so many of even the short satisfactions of human existence as Christians do give up for the sake of illusive hopes for the future.

"Following the most approved method of the inductive philosophy, one line of reasoning I have followed has started with the sheer physical existence of the Bible, which I can see and handle and read with my own eyes. It is certainly a known fact from which to start.

"The next question is where it came from and when and by whom was it written. The rules of legal evidence require that a book or document must be 'authenticated' before it can be 'admitted in evidence' and its contents used and examined.

"As to the Old Testament, it is a commonplace of profane history that it was translated by the 'Seventy' from Hebrew into Greek, two hundred eighty-five years before Christ, by order of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and we can safely assume it was in existence before it was translated. As a matter of fact, nothing is better established than that the bulk of it was written many centuries before this; but if the Old Testament canon was completed at a time which left a gap of nearly three centuries, even, before the Man was born whose life, as recorded by the writers of the Gospels, fulfilled in detail the scores of prophecies in the Jewish Testament about Someone Who was coming, it suffices for the present purpose.

ANCIENT DOCUMENTS

"In regard to the books which make up the New Testament, it is obvious that they had to be written by someone before they could be

quoted by anyone, and since we find them cited, quoted, listed, catalogued, harmonized, by men of the second century, some of whom were Christians and others of whom were pagans (like Celsus, who was born only fifty years after the death of the Apostle John, and who wrote vigorously against the Christian faith and used very much the same arguments in his attack as are used by his two-thousand-years-later successors), we know for a certainty that the New Testament books, and more specifically the Gospels, which Celsus quotes, were written by men who lived at or about the time of the events recorded, or in some portion of the first century.

"The early date of these biographies, and the widespread scattering abroad of copies of them, made utterly impossible, it seems to me, any alteration of them or legendary additions to them. Even a hasty reference to almost any one of the numerous scholarly works on the Christian Evidences will bring you into contact with an overwhelming weight of specific evidence that the Gospels were familiar to, and quoted voluminously by, men who were almost and in some cases actually contemporaries of the Apostle John (a copy of whose Gospel, in which are recorded, by the way, some of Christ's greatest miracles, was declared only a few weeks ago by Dr. Henry Cuppy, the Librarian of the Rylands Library at Manchester, England, to have been found among the papyri in his custody, which copy he says 'probably was written before the ink of the original dried in the early part of the second century or even in the last part of the first century'). A book published by the Luttworth Press, 4 Bouverie Street, London, England, called the 'Codex Sinaiticus,' and written by the learned discoverer of that manuscript, Professor Constantine Tischendorf, will also give you in brief compass an intimation of the mass of evidence on this point; and if you will refer to a work called 'The Testimony of the Evangelists,' written by Simon Greenleaf, the author of the greatest work on legal evidence known to the lawyers of the English-speaking nations, you will find the statement that the authenticity of the Gospels is better established than that of the *corpus juris civilis*, the basic law of Continental Europe.

RELIABLE EYEWITNESSES

"With this point settled, as I am sure it is in the minds of all men free enough from prejudice to follow the laws of thought and so be entitled to the name of 'freethinker,' which we both claim, these Gospel records are entitled, under the rules of both law and reason, to careful investigation for such information as their contents can give us; and to come quickly to the heart of the argument, we find the writers allege that they saw take place, under such circumstances of roadside publicity as to make illusion and imposture impossible, things of such nature that, if the events alleged really took place, the supernatural origin and authority of the Christian religion and its founder are established.

"The issue between faith and unbelief has never, so far as I know,

been drawn at this point but at a subsequent one which I will next consider. If a certain man did really do in the presence of the Gospel writers the things they set forth,—*i. e.*, heal lepers with a touch, restore sight to the blind with a word, feed thousands with a few loaves and fish, stop a storm with an order, raise the dead by a word of command, suffer public execution whose exact details He told in advance, with the statement that the endurance of these things was purely voluntary on His part and would be followed by His resurrection and rejoining of His disciples on the third day after His death,—and then actually return from the grave and show Himself alive to His disciples by 'many infallible proofs' (by sight, sound, touch), probably no rational and 'freethinking' man will refuse to admit that such a man, if he ever lived, with such powers over life and death and nature, would be entitled to be heard as speaking truth and with finality on religion and life after death. And if the incidents of His life really took place, their correspondence in multiplied detail with the features which were to identify the coming One whose advent, at the time Christ appeared, was presaged by the Sybilline Books as quoted by Virgil in his Fourth Eclogue and by other Latin writers, as well as by the Jewish prophets (who were doubtless the source of the ancient world's expectation of a Man from Heaven who would bring back the Golden Age) affords us another conclusive proof of the supernatural in this matter.

CHOOSING THE BEST OF THREE VIEWS

"But the vital question remains, did the things alleged really take place? The steps by which we have been forced to this last question and vital issue seem to me to be logically inevitable. But those by which we are forced beyond it seem equally so, for, on closely examining the depositions or written testimony of the evangelists, we find of the three alternative possibilities, that the witnesses and writers were lying, sincerely mistaken, or telling the truth, only the last is rationally tenable.

"The facts alleged in the Gospels are physical facts, unmistakable in their nature, done in broad daylight, in touching distance of the beholders; and the crowning fact alleged of the bodily resurrection of Christ is probably the most unmistakable conceivable, for mistake in this matter is prevented by the difference between the appearance, action, odor, conversation of a live man and the inaction and decay of a dead one. Therefore the writers who allege the miracles and resurrection of Christ cannot be given the charitable mantle of honest error if their books are false. If the things did not happen, the writers knew they were lying; and that they were lying is the only remaining thing to which a man can cling to avoid being pushed over the brink—not into the gloomy abyss of infidelity, but into the discovery that his feet have all the time been but a few inches from such solid ground for belief as to make refusal to rest upon it irrational.

"But even this fingernail hold on unbelief is readily seen to be hope-

lessly untenable when we remember that nothing in history is better established than the fact that the Gospel writers, and those who believed their report and became Christians, were subjected (both at the hands of the Jews, who were incensed at being told that they had slain their own promised Messiah, and of the Pagans who were enraged at being told that all the gods in their Pantheon were but myths and the Pontifex Maximus at Rome but the perpetrator of a hoax, and that the only true God was the One who became incarnate as a Jew and died on a cross) to lifelong persecution, frequent torture, and ultimate death. Now as surely as the human frame shrinks from pain and death, no man ever lied when the natural and sole result of his lying was to incur all the evils possible to suffer in this life and punishment for his lie in any possible life to come. To conclude with the words of Simon Greenleaf in considering this phase of the matter:

“ ‘From these absurdities there is no escape, but in the perfect conviction and admission that they were good men, testifying to that which they had carefully observed and considered and well knew to be true’ (Greenleaf, ‘Testimony of the Evangelists,’ p. 31).

“ Now at what point or at which step, between the starting one of the Bible’s present existence and the conclusion that the testimony of the Gospels is true, can a man take a reasonable and logical stand? Each step seems to me to follow the next as inevitably as gravity operates to cause a man to continue to fall when once he has leaped into space.

“ But even if a man’s emotional antipathy to Bible religion should so interfere with the free operation of his reason as to question the axiomatic truths that a book must be written before it is quoted, that the men of the first century knew a live from a dead man as we do, and that men and women shrank from pain, poverty, persecution, and death then as we do now, and would not knowingly propagate a lie whose only effect was to incur these things, we have what might be called a forgotten infallible proof of the historic truth of the Gospel records in the form of the cross-examination to which they may be subjected, which operates with as full and conclusive force now as if the events had taken place in our own lifetime. For we find on comparing the four Gospels and the Book of the Acts, along with those easily avoidable and completely reconciled apparent inconsistencies right on the surface which prove the absence of conscious and collusive fraud, such a correspondence in minute and obscure details with each other, with Josephus and other contemporaneous writers and with archeological discoveries, as establishes their truth as infallibly as thumbprints prove the identity of the man whose thumb alone coincides with them.

“ If perchance you have not already done so, may I suggest for your consideration the works of some great Christian freethinkers, Mark Hopkins, Paley, Greenleaf, and many others whose writings appear to

me to be splendid samples of thinking freed from all constraints of prejudice and emotional antipathy and the like, and everything but the liberating compulsion of the laws of reason and logic. An *ex parte* study of any disputed matter is, of course, unworthy of intelligent men, and the very title of freethinker which we both cherish indicates a determination on our part not to fear the face or logic of any man, but to follow truth even if it leads to the 'gates of hell.' Will any brave freethinker refuse to follow it if it leads instead to the gates of Heaven?"

—I. H. LINTON, by permission of *Sunday School Times*.

APPENDIX "D"

DID JOSEPHUS REALLY MENTION JESUS CHRIST?

WHAT IS THE VERDICT OF REAL SCHOLARSHIP?

CHRIST is the only character in all history who has four contemporary biographers and historians, every one of whom suffered persecution in attestation of the truthfulness of his narrative. But, while we do not need the mild testimony of the placid historian Flavius Josephus so long as we have the burning words of the apostolic eyewitnesses who were under divine compulsion to declare the things they had seen and heard, the testimony of Josephus is not to be lightly cast aside; for all the evidence there is, both external and internal, supports its authenticity. Those who contend to the contrary do so "without evidence against evidence."

Instead of its being a fact that the reference to Christ is not found in any of the older manuscripts and copies of Josephus' history, *it is found in all of them*. So far from its being true that "all real scholars are agreed that it is an interpolation,"—a loud sounding phrase which means simply that all scholars of a certain way of thinking agree among themselves that anyone who does not agree with them shall in their little circle not be regarded as real scholars, agreement being *their* acid test of scholarship,—anyone undertaking to "give a reason" would find himself hard put to it to justify a rejection of the paragraph in question. And it should be remembered that it is not only one paragraph with which we have to do, but that there is another, whose authenticity Horne says has never been questioned by anyone, and which is hard indeed to account for except in the light of the first.

WHERE THE BURDEN OF PROOF RESTS

Two or three things are worth remembering in this connection before considering the direct evidence of authenticity of this passage.

First. Even though there seems to be nothing but supporting proof for the passage, the "burden of proof" does not rest upon those who cite it, but upon those who dispute it. See Greenleaf on "Evidence."

Second. If Josephus had not spoken, his silence would have been almost more significant than his speaking of Christ, as showing a purposeful avoidance of the name of a "pretender" to the Messiahship whose claims gave more trouble to those who rejected Him than did those of other and obscure false Messiahs whom he does mention.

Third. The unscholarly bias of those who subject the Bible, which is the most ancient, authenticated, and august of writings, to a pre-

sumption of falsity from which the meanest of other histories and historians are exempted, shows an animus on the part of hostile Bible critics which largely discounts their opinions. Their position is that every other ancient writer is presumed to be true until proved false; but that every Scriptural writer is presumed to be false until corroborated from some profane source. Professor Robert Dick Wilson considers this unscholarly bias of Bible critics most pungently in his "Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament," and Simon Greenleaf quotes and adopts as his own the remarks of Chalmers, in his "Evidences":

MANY PROOFS OF JOSEPHUS' TESTIMONY

"How does it happen that the authority of Josephus should be acquiesced in as a first principle, while every step in the narrative of the evangelists must have foreign testimony to confirm and support it? . . . How comes it that the evangelists, with as much internal and vastly more external evidence in their favor, should be made to stand before Josephus like so many prisoners at the bar of justice. . . . But we are not sorry for it. It has given more triumph and confidence to the argument. And it is no small addition to our faith that its first teachers have survived an examination which in point of rigor and severity we believe to be quite unexampled in the annals of criticism."

But now for the proofs that Josephus did indeed testify of the Christ, in which matter I can do no better than to quote literally a portion of Thomas Hartwell Horne's great old work, the "Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures," from which all subsequent writers gather material when writing on the Evidences:

"Josephus, though a strict Pharisee, has borne such a noble testimony to the spotless character of Jesus Christ that Jerome considered and called him a Christian writer. Mr. Thiston, and some modern writers, are of opinion that He was a Nazarene or Ebionite Jewish Christian; while others have affirmed that the passage, above cited from his 'Jewish Antiquities,' is an interpolation, principally (it should seem) on the ground that it is too favorable to be given by a Jew to Christ; and that, if Josephus did consider Jesus to be the Christ or expected Messiah of the Jews, he must have been a believer in Him, in which case he would not have despatched the miraculous history of the Saviour of the world in one short paragraph. When, however, the evidence on both sides is fairly weighed, we apprehend that it will be found to preponderate most decidedly in favor of the genuineness of this testimony of Josephus: for,

"1. *It is found in all the copies* of Josephus' works, which are now extant, whether printed or manuscript; in a *Hebrew* translation preserved in the Vatican Library,¹ and in an Arabic Version preserved by the Maronites of Mount Libanus.

"2. It is cited by Eusebius, Jerome, Rufinus the antagonist of Jerome,

¹ Baronius ("Annales Ecclesiastici," ad annum 134) relates that the passage in this Hebrew translation of Josephus was marked with an obelus, which could only have been done by a Jew.

Isidore of Pelusium, Sozomen, Cassiodorus, Nicephorus, and by many other authors, Greeks, Syrians, and Egyptians, of the fourth and fifth centuries; all of whom had indisputably seen various manuscripts, and of considerable antiquity. How then can men, living eleven or twelve hundred years *after* these writers,—and who are so remote both from the sources consulted by them, as well as from the events related by them,—prove that all sagacity is exclusively reserved for our times?

"3. Josephus not only mentions with respect John the Baptist, but also James the first bishop of Jerusalem,—*'Ananus [he says] assembled the Jewish Sanhedrin, and brought before it JAMES the brother of Jesus who is called Christ, with some others, whom he delivered over to be stoned as infractors of the law.'* This passage, the authenticity of which has *never* been disputed or suspected, contains an evident reference to what had already been related concerning Christ; for why else should he describe James—a man of himself but little known—as the brother of Jesus, if he had made no mention of Jesus before?

"4. It is highly improbable that Josephus, who has discussed with such minuteness the history of this period,—mentioned Judas of Galilee, Theudas, and other obscure pretenders to the character of the Messiah, as well as John the Baptist and James the brother of Christ,—should have preserved the profoundest silence concerning Christ, Whose name was at that time so celebrated among the Jews, and also among the Romans, two of whose historians (Suetonius and Tacitus) have distinctly taken notice of Him. . . .

"5. It is morally impossible that this passage either was or could be forged by Eusebius, who first cited it, or by any other earlier writer. Had such a forgery been attempted, it would unquestionably have been detected by some of the acute and inveterate enemies of Christianity; for both Josephus and his works were so well received among the Romans, that he was enrolled a citizen of Rome, and had a statue erected to his memory. His writings were also admitted into the Imperial Library. The Romans may further be considered as the guardians of the integrity of his text; and the Jews, we may be assured, would use all diligence, to prevent any interpolation in favor of the Christian cause. Yet it cannot be discovered that any objection was ever made to this passage by any of the opposers of the Christian faith in the early ages; their silence therefore concerning such a charge is a decisive proof that the passage is not a forgery. Indeed, the Christian cause is so far from needing any fraud to support it, that nothing could be more destructive to its interest than a fraud so palpable and obtrusive."

Having considered carefully the reasons why we may conclude that in reading the words recorded in Josephus' history we hear the very language of a man who added his testimony to that of the apostles, let us read the words themselves:

"Now there was about this time, Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man; for he performed many wonderful works. He drew over to him many of the Jews, and also of the Gentiles. This was the

Christ. And when Pilate, at the instigation of the principal men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those who had loved him from the first did not cease to adhere to him. For he appeared to them alive again on the third day; the divine prophets having foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him. And the tribe of Christians, so named from him, subsists to this time."

And now, two thousand years after Josephus, the "tribe of Christians" subsists even to this time and longs and looks eagerly for the next sight of "this same Jesus," who said, "I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also."

And may we not all entertain the lively hope that in Josephus we not only have another witness to our Lord, but, noting how closely his written testimony complies with the terms of the contract and covenant that, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved," we have in this famous old historian a brother in the Lord and a fellow member of the household of faith whose fellowship and conversation will add not a little to the social joys of the coming King's Court?

—I. H. LINTON, by permission of *Sunday School Times*.

APPENDIX "E"

"IF HE NEVER LIVED—WHAT OF THAT?"

A CHRISTIAN LAWYER OFFERS AN ANSWER

I AM sure there are thousands of us who are still sound enough, not only in the faith, but in "mind, memory, and understanding," to know that, if the truth about any facts ever imagined or alleged *does* make a difference, it is the truth about those which have been reported to us in the Bible about the Lord Jesus Christ. We can be sure, also, that every man has a creed about these things—positively or negatively—and that the only way not to have a creed is not to have a thought.

The message is given to us that God the Son died for us. He whose reply is, "What of that?" in effect says, "Unimportant if true." We know from the bloody sweat of Christ in the Garden, and His cry of anguish from the Cross when our sins alienated His Father from Him, that the transaction of Calvary seemed important to Christ. But it seems unimportant to the Modernist. "Perhaps it never was of any matter."

"IS IT NOTHING TO YOU?"

Our Lord cries from the cross: "Behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow, which is brought unto me." "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?" And the Modernist answer is: "Nothing at all. Whether you were just a man or really incarnate deity, 'the everlasting God, Jehovah, the Creator of the ends of the earth,' whether you died voluntarily out of love for me or just because you couldn't help it, whether you did or did not rise from the dead, are all matters of unimportance and indifference." "What of that?"

Could any layman, minister, or missionary board better prove unbelief of the allegations of the Gospels than to express or tolerate the idea that they are without importance? The great Character of the Gospels is alleged to have been Jehovah-Jesus; the thing He is said to have done, the most terrific and momentous conceivable in its bearing upon human life (the difference between eternal bliss and eternal misery); and the alleged resurrection the complete answer to the age-long cry, "If a man die, shall he live again?" Will any sane man say that the things alleged are unimportant? "Unimportant even if true"? Impossible. "Unimportant because manifestly untrue"? That is sane at least; but it brands a person an infidel who has no place in the Presbyterian or any other Christian Church.

Do we not see, in this contemptuous remark, that the whole story about Christ is unimportant—"What of that?"—an illustration of that

egotism which is at the bottom of all sin from that of Lucifer to yours and mine? We assert the right to act according to our own will and impulse rather than in conformity to God's law. Then, if there be sin to atone for, we will do it for ourselves. We are not so low as to ask another to do it for us. "What *Christ* did, living and dying, is not important. What *I* do, is. I don't need His imputed righteousness; I have my own."

Unitarian Arius admitted the fact of Calvary to be important, and the identity of the victim so tremendously so that he could not believe one so maltreated as was the Christ could be a Person of the Trinity. Thus also reasoned pagan Celsus. In a way, Celsus honored the greatness of Christ's sacrifice by thinking it incredible that a God could descend so low or give to His creatures so self-sacrificing a love. I would rather stand with Celsus in the great day, with this attitude toward the atonement, than with those who say the deity of Christ, the identity of Christ, the very fact of Christ, are unimportant. "Suppose He never lived, what of that?"

If a man were reported killed in England who resembled the Prince of Wales, the truth of the rumor and the identity of the victim would be important. But whether the man who was crucified was the "Prince of Glory," the Person Who created the universe and Whose heart broke in redeeming it, and Who sustains "all things by the word of his power,"—that power which keeps in vibration the electrons that are the stuff of which the universe is made, that power which if withdrawn for a moment would cause all things to cease and vanish and "leave not a wrack behind,"—whether the victim of Calvary was that Being, and whether there was really a victim and really a Calvary—all these things are of so little consequence that it is now unimportant, not only whether Christ was man or God, but even whether he was man or myth: merely a wild thought from a fevered brain, a fable from a false pen, a lying word from a foolish mouth. "What if Christ never lived, what of that?"

I have read that Mahatma Gandhi has said that in his dying he wants to hold on to the tail of a cow. To the Hindu the cow is sacred, and her tail is at least a real thing. Would not even the real tail of a cow be a better thing to trust to in a time of need than a false tale about a man who never lived?

How hard it is to win fame in the honest, faithful path of duty! How easy it is to get notoriety, fame's evil converse, by betraying it! How few men walking down the street on their feet are noticed; how instantly is a man who walks on his hands! And how many religious leaders have found the short cut to notoriety by preaching infidelity from a Christian pulpit! Surely Mrs. Buck had won enough fame by her novel, whose moldy flavor of Chinese moral depravity so enlivens her vivid picture of Oriental life, not to need the notoriety her supercilious question about the importance of Christ's career has brought her.

I am sure she had no idea of the inevitable implications of her question. But could Paul of Tarsus after the Damascus road meeting, or anyone who has had the Holy Spirit whisper into his ear the tremendous secret of Jesus Christ's real identity, ask, "What if He never lived, what of that?"

AS IMPORTANT AS ETERNITY

The identity and authority of the Man who said of Himself, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him," are matters of supreme importance to every soul. The accuracy of the quotation and the authority of the speaker are as important to us as eternity itself. If Christ was God and spoke the words, whether a man believes on Him makes the difference between the wrath of God and the love of God; Heaven and hell. "What of that?" *That* of that.

We read in John's Epistle that he who denies that Jesus is come in the flesh is antichrist, or against Christ. Where does the missionary or the mission board stand, in the light of this text, with a statement that it makes too little difference whether Christ did or did not come in the flesh, to form an opinion about the matter or test other Christians' right to the name with reference to it?

Is not this supercilious attitude toward what the Church in all ages has been willing to die to maintain as Christianity's eternal, factual verities, the basic issue between Modernism and Fundamentalism? When I learn from the Auburn Affirmation that the signers used the words "facts" and "theories" as interchangeable and equivalent in meaning, and hear, from the New York pulpit whose weird utterances in the name of Christianity have given it so wide notoriety, such a pronouncement as that "the Apostles' Creed is a formula by which men of an early and unscientific age expressed their faith," but not necessarily their belief in the objective reality of the sober, concrete facts recited, and thus learn that to a Modernist real facts mean the same as a fictitious formula, belief the same as unbelief, that "born of the virgin Mary" is merely a complimentary phrase expressing admiration for Christ's unique character, that "the third day he rose again from the dead" means merely that the untrue legend about Him is still inspiring, and that "he shall come again to judge the quick and the dead" means only that the cult growing out of the falsehoods related about Him is a constructive influence in improving social and hygienic conditions, then human language seems to me to have lost sense and definition, and the whole controversy to partake of the nature of a hearing "*de lunatico inquirendo*."

APPLYING LUNACY TESTS

I have gone so far as to say to myself, "Somebody's crazy." And to reassure myself that it is *not* my fellow Fundamentalists and myself, I recall that sane men of sober mind live in the world and on the plane of

objective reality, and mentally unbalanced men in the realm where the real and the unreal, the objective and the subjective, are mixed and confused. By the tests applied in a lunacy hearing, it is not the hard-headed, matter-of-fact, literal-minded, prosaic Fundamentalist who is "*non compos mentis*." He deals with *realities*. To him, things are real or unreal, an allegation is the truth or a lie. To the Modernist the unreal is as good as the real. "What if He never lived, what of that? What's the difference between the false and the true, the real and unreal, fact, formula, theory? One is as good as another in my brain."

God grant that people who have never needed anything more than a poem or an interesting story to inspire and help them may soon find the Christ who is real in His person and infinite in His power. When we are "at ease," and the baby hasn't the croup, and there is not an earthquake going on or a storm at sea, a lovely legend is as stimulating as a true Gospel, and not nearly so hampering to our natural impulses. But "when the storms of life o'ertake us," when death is upon us, we need a real Christ as badly as a ship about to be blown ashore needs, not the mental concept, but the metal reality of an anchor to hang to.

"Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the *THINGS* which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip."—Hebrews 2: 1.

—I. H. LINTON, by permission of *Sunday School Times*.

APPENDIX "F"

"DEMOLISHING THE TEN COMMANDMENTS IN TEN MINUTES"

By Dan Gilbert and I. H. Linton

ON a Monday morning, a professor of sociology in one of our larger state universities faced his students in a high state of indignation. In his hand he held the morning paper; it was the report of a sermon delivered the previous day which upset him. Communism had been denounced in the sermon, on the ground that its tenets violated the Ten Commandments; the minister had held that the Ten Commandments are eternally valid, that to ignore them today will lead the modern age into the same chaos that it led all former generations into.

The sociology professor sourly remarked, "If there is one thing worse than a political reactionary it is a reactionary moralist." He continued:

"The Ten Commandments are hopelessly out of date. They are a tie which binds the civilized world to barbarism. They are anti-social, and based on superstition. They are many, many times older than the Constitution; and, I might add, they were written by much more stupid men. Unpleasant as their dead hand may be upon progress, there were some rather brilliant men at the Constitutional Convention. But you all know how antiquated their handiwork is, how destructive it is in its effects upon modern progress. Well, the same holds true of the Ten Commandments—only more so. . . . Why, any intelligent person can demolish the Ten Commandments in ten minutes."

This he proceeded to attempt to do. The following is an accurate, although not a verbatim report of his remarks. While his blasphemous words shed much light on the methods of assault on religion practiced by certain professors, the most significant thing about the incident is the colossal conceit of this professor. His overbearing arrogance, his egregious egotism, his Lucifer-like temerity and effrontery—these should stir, as nothing else, the righteous resentment of the Christian citizens who pay his salary. The professor's remarks are set forth by Dr. Dan Gilbert, the reply by I. H. Linton.

I. Thou shalt have no other gods before me.

The Professor: The First Commandment is the basis and promoter of what religious intolerance and bigotry remain in this age of agnosticism. The command, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," was, of course, framed by ancient priestly politicians who used it as a yoke upon the people. They knew that there is no God—there are just

concepts of God. They had a *concept* of God which suited their purposes very well. They told the people, therefore, that no one else's concept of God would be tolerated. They thus created a monopoly on God—their peculiar concept of Deity was the only legal one; all others were bootleg. . . . Religious intolerance and bigotry are always evil; therefore this Commandment is now, and has always been, a means of degrading those who accept it.

Mr. Linton: The weapon here used in "demolishing" the Commandment is the dogmatic assertion that there is no God; but no man with any training in logic would reason from an unproved assertion, and no philosopher would attempt to prove a universal negative. Writes Flint ("Anti-Theistic Theories," p. 9): "Before a man could be warranted to affirm that nowhere is there any trace of God's existence, he must have seen it all (the whole universe) and comprehended it all, which would require omnipresence and omniscience, or, in other words, would imply that he is himself God."

The establishing of this implied claim can logically be insisted upon before the necessity of further repairs to the Ten Commandments is conceded.

II. *Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.*

The Professor: The Second Commandment is simply a more vicious form of the first one. It gives an insight into the kind of concept of God which the First Commandment recognizes and prescribes. It speaks of a jealous God who takes His spite out on unborn generations. It presents an infantile concept of God. If this concept of God could be forever wiped from the brain of man, the world at once would become a better place to live in.

Mr. Linton: How glad we can be that the great God loves us enough to be "jealous" of our affection in return, and unwilling that it be given to false and hurtful objects; and how grateful for the restraint of the warning that a man's sins affect his children as well as himself, since *that is the way it works in nature and reality*, whether or not a man believes there is any god to blame in the matter!

III. *Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.*

The Professor: The Commandment against taking the Lord's name in vain is more absurd than pernicious. Certainly there is no moral or social harm in profanity; on the other hand, no damage is done by abstaining from profanity. There is, of course, a real danger in elevating a silly taboo into a moral law. There is also a menace in this practice of superstitiously thinking that a God capable of making the universe would be interested in the kind of language which puny men may use to express their thoughts or their emotions. This Commandment stultifies the mind of man. It degrades our thinking, even if it does not have any really bad effects from a social or moral standpoint.

Mr. Linton: A man's name is himself; our expression of love or contempt for the name of any friend or of God is our attitude toward His being.

Even if God were unreal, as is contended, His name is that of man's highest concept, and there is certain reverence due even to noble abstractions. Life would be poorer, not richer, if men spoke contemptuously of self-sacrifice and honor among men, and of the name of the God who is the source, and in any event the symbol, of all that is holy and righteous. And if by chance the millions of scholarly believers have been right, and He

" Whose throne is fixed,
Who reigns supreme,
The everlasting God,"

survived the shock of the puff of hot air of the statement "abolishing" him, "a God capable of making the universe" would be a Being of such august majesty, power, and benevolence that nothing could be more appropriate than to speak even His name with reverent awe.

IV. Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.

The Professor: The commandment requiring that the Sabbath Day be kept holy is one of those rules which may have been all right at an earlier stage in our economic and social development, but which is now antiquated. I rather suspect that the idea of laying off work for one day in every seven was first conceived by remote precursors of the labor movement. Possibly this commandment has helped in shortening the working week of labor. But, whatever it may have done to gain rest during one day out of seven, it certainly can't advance the cause of the

five-day, thirty-hour week. Of course, it never was an unmixed blessing. It served as an excuse for sadists who insisted that the laborer "rest" on the Sabbath by going to church and filling his head with stuffy superstition and morbid theology. From a mental standpoint, if not from a physical one, it would have been more wholesome for our Puritan ancestors to have worked on the Sabbath rather than to have observed it in the stupid manner prescribed by religious morons, neurotics, and fanatics.

Mr. Linton: The trouble with the Fourth Commandment apparently is that it follows the "law of the octave" stamped all over nature, instead of the latest regulation of some labor union organizer who has decreed that five days is long enough to work; and further, that some people still waste time going to church on that day and hearing expounded such words as Paul wrote to the Ephesians, "Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour. . . . Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth. . . . Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour . . . be put away from you, with all malice; and be ye kind one to another,"—instead of the shouts and shots and curses of such "movies" as "Klondike Annie," and "Merrily We Go To Hell," and the like. The rest of the citizens are apt to be on the highways risking "sudden death" and dismemberment; and isn't it a question whether the nation could long survive an even more ample opportunity for the decay of morality and decimation of the population?

V. Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

The Professor: The sentimental commandment about honoring one's parents is the blind behind which the children of earlier ages were regarded as chattels. It was this commandment which justified—indeed, directed—parents to feed their children into the child labor system. They felt that their offspring were not properly honoring them unless they readily went to work at an early age in some coal mine or factory. It was this commandment which added a sense of moral righteousness to the natural selfishness and tyrannical disposition of the older generation. The young, of course, were threatened with hellfire unless they consented to honor their parents in this manner. Hence, we never had a revolt of youth against degradation and exploitation in the factories. This iniquitous commandment crushed even the instinct of self-preservation out of children.

Mr. Linton: Whether or not parents use the Fifth Commandment to make their children go to work at an early age, infants frequently use the colic to make their parents go to work at an early hour. Love and deference to those who cared for us in our troublesome infancy and provided the joys of a home would seem to be both basically just and

practically useful. "Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honour the face of the old man. . . . I am the Lord," is a blessed commandment, contributing to social happiness, since those who do the honoring will one day be the honored, the old have the encouragement of being treated with affection and esteem, and the young have the benefit of the wisdom and counsel of those who have gone before them on the course they must follow. If "youth must be served," it can be served by nothing so well as by the wisdom of age; and the truth of Francis Bacon's aphorism, "Young men for action, old men for counsel," is as well established and as useful as any adage the experience of mankind has brought forth.

So far from the labors that most homes require of children—filling the wood box, milking the cow—being hurtful, Roger Babson in his "Fundamentals of Prosperity" gives them as the chief element in the success so often attained by men from rural homes. And do we not all know a hundred cases of parental self-sacrifice for their children to one of exploitation of the children?

VI. *Thou shalt not kill.*

The Professor: The Commandment against murder is really just a joke. The people who believe in it most violate it most. Most wars have been the product of religious fanatics who believed devoutly in the sanctity of human life. It is only in this age of agnosticism that anyone even really wants peace. The believers in the Ten Commandments never really wanted anything but war; they just pretended to. They are only against killing when it will relieve instead of increase human misery. Hence, they are all against "mercy" killings. That is about all this Commandment does now—block all humanitarian advances which seek to relieve suffering.

Mr. Linton: The evils of disobedience to a law or commandment are powerful proofs of its validity and value. The lie that Christian men and nations who reverence the commandment are the worst violators of it is disproved by the Church and police court records and the present state of the world. Our country regards the Commandments and has made efforts for peace the sincerity of which no man can fairly deny; while Russia, which has repudiated them, has built up the greatest war machine in history.

As to "mercy killings," the distrust with which any sick person would take a dose of medicine or submit to an operation if euthanasia were legalized, and the evils and crimes such a custom would introduce, are so obvious as not to need consideration.

The World War started as a result of an assassin at Sarajevo breaking this commandment against murder, and a violation of some commandment could probably be found as the real *casus belli* of every war in history.

VIII. *Thou shalt not steal.*

The Professor: The commandment against theft is meaningless, from a moral standpoint. Pilate may well have asked, "What is theft?" Proudhon said, with much truth, that "Property is theft." The commandment against theft of property, therefore, simply functions to prevent the people from taking back from the capitalists and exploiters the property which the latter stole in the first place. Hence, it is a means of perpetuating injustice. Under it, the man who has stolen a lot of property and got away with it is permitted to keep his ill-gotten gains. And if we try to take them away from him, then our worthy clergy call us "Communists," and demand that we stop violating their precious Decalogue. There never will be social justice in this world until this Commandment is tossed on the scrap-heap.

Mr. Linton: How could society exist for a day if the "truth" announced by somebody named Proudhon were acted on, and if one kept possession and use of only what his hands could hold while he was awake to retain it? Is every article of property possessed by every man "stolen property"? Are the professor's own hat and pants stolen property, and are they proper subjects for sudden, violent, and embarrassing change of possession at any moment? If there is a single honestly acquired thing anywhere, there is use for this commandment. Would theft be a good thing if a "capitalist" (anyone who has not yet spent all his wages) took something from a proletarian? What's to protect the property of proletarians when all is in their hands if there is no rule or practice against theft?

Surely the merry device invented by George Bernard Shaw of "making the worse appear the better reason," of standing moral things on their heads with a serio-comic attempt to make such an attitude plausible, seldom had a more absurd *reductio ad absurdum* than the professor's solemn, oracular "demolishing" of the Eighth Commandment.

VII. *Thou shalt not commit adultery.*

The Professor: I considered, purposely, the commandment against theft before I took up the one dealing with adultery. The reason for doing this is that the commandment against adultery is just a form of the one dealing with theft. Under the Biblical view, sex relations are supposed to be regulated along the same lines as private property. Marriage is one form of property. Hence adultery is a form of theft. Any civilized person, of course, rejects the proposition that a man can have property rights in the body of a woman just because he is married to her. We moderns reject the idea that marriage can create property interests in human flesh. Hence we must look upon the concept that adultery is "theft" as a barbarous superstition.

Mr. Linton: It is not property rights, or female flesh and bones, that the Seventh Commandment deals with, but the freedom and sanctity of

contracts and plighted honor and the purity of lines of descent. A stock breeder takes more care in producing animals than the professor advocates for the generation of immortal human beings.

"Jealousy is the rage of a man," says Solomon, and the newspaper beside me has more than one account of lurid crimes committed during the last week because of violations of this Commandment which the Creator of human hearts and emotions gave to safeguard us against the most maddening impulses known to men and women. Would human life be happier if this Commandment were really demolished, and the husband going cheerily to work for the wife and babies at home did not know that his wife's instinctive and sacred regard for this Commandment protected her against pollution and his hearth from children of uncertain paternity? A "barbarous superstition"—this rule of the game of life which safeguards us against the keenest of emotional pangs and gives security to the most blissful and peaceful joys known to human existence!

IX. *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.*

The Professor: The Commandment against bearing false witness is all right, theoretically; but it is all wrong practically. Nobody really observes it; it just makes for hypocrisy. It is intended to make for honesty and truthfulness; in reality it promotes the opposite. If we got rid of it, there would be more honesty and less hypocrisy in the world and in our law courts.

Mr. Linton: In dealing with the commandment against lying the professor again fails to demolish the commandment and attacks violations of it, thereby *establishing what he undertook to destroy*. Just why abolishing this fundamental law of morals, science, and thought itself would result in "more honesty and less hypocrisy in the world and in our law courts" is hard to imagine, except possibly on the same reasoning that assured us that repealing the Eighteenth Amendment and putting liquor under the eye and nose of every man, woman, and child who buys anything or goes anywhere would result in less drinking. Truth and accuracy, and the expression and recording of true relations between men, things, and events, are the very cement that holds society together and makes scientific discovery possible.

It would be well for the professor to heed this commandment in making out his income tax return, anyway.

X. *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbour's.*

The Professor: The commandment against coveting has two purposes: one is to hold the poor in check and keep them in bondage; the other is to glorify the rich. The rich, of course, don't covet anything

the poor have; they are free from this "vice"; hence, they derive a certain saintly quality by virtue of their being Simon-pure of offense against the Tenth Commandment. On the other hand, the commandment makes villains out of the poor. If they so much as suggest that they would like to have back some of the good things of life stolen from them through processes of exploitation, they are at once charged with being "covetous." If they are of a religious turn of mind, they usually are thus "convicted of sin," and they meekly drive all thoughts of justice from their minds and reconcile themselves to squalor and degradation. The effects of this commandment, when practiced in human society, are unspeakably bad.

Mr. Linton: The diatribe against the Tenth Commandment doesn't recognize, apparently, that the offence of coveting can be committed by anyone but a poor man against a "capitalist." It assumes that no one, anywhere, has anything but ill-gotten gains in his possession.

Suppose a lazy non-worker sees his hard-working fellow man going home with the fruits of his labor in field or factory; would it be a good and not an evil thing for the shiftless man to covet his neighbor's hard-earned wages, to steal them from him, and possibly to kill him in doing so, thereby "demolishing" in practice three of the "anti-social" commandments which the professor attempts to demolish? And if the frantic Red dream should ever come true, and the management of property and affairs were in the proletarian hands least skilled and experienced in administering them, some regulations will be needed for life even then, as always where several people live together or act in concert; and can fewer, simpler, more fundamental ones than those Moses promulgated be imagined, even aside from all question of their divine origin?

And now I feel like taking my brain out and dusting it off after cluttering it up with such folly as we have been considering.

And proud I am of the way I have repaired and restored those commandments after their "demolishing"—as proud as an army corps of British engineers might be after they had got Gibraltar all plumb and cemented together again after it had been knocked to pieces by a bombardment of soap bubbles!

—I. H. LINTON, by permission of *Sunday School Times*.

APPENDIX "G"

ANSWERING THE ATHEIST

A CIRCULAR sent me following the publication of some articles by the Atheist Association of America starts in with this leading paragraph:

To a candid world we submit this document. If it is true, the Church ought to go out of business. If the clergy can disprove it, we shall cease attacking the Bible.

This folder indicts the Bible as inauthentic, incredible, and immoral, supporting each charge with evidence. Refute it, Christians, if you can, or confess that your religion is false. Clergymen, Sunday School teachers, Bible Societies and Institutes, Gideons, Daughters of the American Revolution, and Federated Clubwomen, can you answer—

Is the evidence true? Look up the references. Read with an open mind. Decide for yourself.

To which last we say Amen.

* * * * *

The first paragraph of this folder reads:

STARTLING FACTS. The Bible is one of twenty-seven books for which divine origin is claimed. Christians deny the divinity of all bibles but their own. We deny the divinity of only one more than they do.

Exactly so. If the Bible were not the *only* divine revelation it would not be a divine revelation at all, for then its claim to be the only true revelation would be false, and "*falsus in uno falsus in omnibus*." The argument is an echo of that of Volney's "Ruins of Empires," that, since many other books besides the Bible claim to be divine, therefore none is divine. Does our atheist friend desire to commit himself to such reasoning? Let's see how it works.

A jeweler has for sale twenty rhinestones, and one real diamond of great value. Can his customer assert that, since there are such things as imitation diamonds, therefore there is no such thing as a real diamond?

Twenty men claim to be the rightful heirs to an estate. The judge does not bother to hear evidence, but readily decides and dismisses the case on the principle that, since all twenty cannot be the rightful heir, therefore none is. Surely our atheist is an astute logician, a veritable "Daniel come to judgment."

Is not nearly everything of real value counterfeited, and does not the fact of imitation itself prove that there is a reality?

Almost the last paragraph of a section entitled "The Pentateuch" is as follows:

Bible scholars have declared against the Mosaic authorship. George Smith of the British Museum unearthed Assyrian terracotta tablets older than the books of Moses, which give accounts of the Creation, the Temptation, the Tower of Babel, and the Flood virtually identical with the Genesis accounts. The Babylonian first man was named Adami. Adam and Eve are not referred to again in the Old Testament.

The Higher Critics (observe, all men of this persuasion, who claim you as allies and helpers) have won. Their victory makes the Fall of Man a fiction and the Atonement an absurdity. The descendants of apes need no saviour.

I will let the "Christian evolutionist" wrestle with the logic of that last sentence; my concern is with that of the first.

Since the Christian belief is that Genesis is a divinely accurate, terse, and vivid record, free from all the absurdities and follies of other writings, of a true tradition in regard to things of common belief and knowledge among the earliest generations, the fact that the Assyrian tablets confirm the Bible narrative would seem to be a strange thing to bring against it. Suppose these tablets had contradicted or ignored these happenings of cosmic importance, would not this exact reverse of the fact now cited against the Bible have been brought with even more force against it by the atheist? Someone coined the phrase, "Logic with a swivel in it." Here is a good illustration of its working. If the records do not mention the things set forth in Genesis, the Genesis story is unconfirmed fiction; if they contradict them, the result is the same only more so; while if they confirm them the result is, obviously, even more fatal to faith in the Bible!

Skipping along almost at random, we read:

Isa. 7: 14. "Virgin" should read "young woman." The tense has also been changed. A manufactured prophecy.

From the time of Luther who wagered ten pounds, which he stated was that much more than he owned in the world, that no instance could be cited in which "almah" meant anything but a virgin, to the late Professor Robert Dick Wilson and ex-Rabbi Leopold Cohn, whose researches show that Luther made a safe bet (some hasty Modernists, with too much imagination and too little patience to indulge in much research, to the contrary notwithstanding), well-informed Hebrew students have known that the explanation of this allegation is that it isn't so.

Just preceding this is the statement:

The Bible begins with a forgery. "In the beginning God" should read "In the beginning the gods." The Hebrew Elohim is plural.

No Trinitarian Christian complains because the very first name of God in the monotheistic Old Testament is one indicating collective, not solitary, unity, so that room is made for the subsequently clearly taught doctrine that our God is a triune God, three Persons in one God. One incidental effect of this revelation is that the "First Cause," the "Unconditioned," the "Absolute," if I recall aright some favorite philosophical terms, is a "Tri-unity" and is revealed in a form not open to the argument advanced by Herbert Spencer that God could not from all eternity be the same and a God of love, because love can only exist where there is an object. I am not a Hebraist, but my recollection is that Moses Maimonides, several centuries after Christ, was so troubled by the support which the Hebrew word "Echad," meaning collective unity—like a bunch of grapes—gave to Trinitarians, that he had altered in many copies of the Jewish Scriptures this word to "Yachid," meaning single unity. All Christians cite the fact mentioned by the atheist author as one supporting their faith, and not opposing it.

Again:

Believe it or not. God instructs Moses how to make a perfume, with death for imitators. Exodus 30: 34-38.

When we turn to Exodus 30: 34-38 and preceding verses we find that God directed the compounding of an ointment or perfume for the strictly religious use of anointing the priests in His worship, and that it is provided, "Whosoever compoundeth any like it, or whosoever putteth any of it upon a stranger, shall even be cut off from his people"—or excluded from their national life and worship until he repented. Would not the august and holy God of the universe have a reasonable right to provide for the exclusive use of certain things in His worship, especially when the object is so obvious, of teaching His idolatrous people, surrounded by nations with unclean gods worshiped in unholy and unclean ways, that their God was one of awful holiness?

Again:

Bible Science. (Stratons, Rileys, and all Fundamentalists, please note.)

Heaven is a solid roof supporting reservoirs of water. Gen. 1: 8. "The windows of heaven were opened." Gen. 7: 11.

The first verse cited, together with the preceding and following ones, read:

And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so. And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day. And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so.

I have read how many billions of tons of water are in suspension in the earth's atmosphere, in the "heaven of the clouds," and how absolutely essential this water vapor is to preserve the relatively equable temperature of the earth, how quickly everything would burn up in the daytime without it and freeze solid at night if it were lacking; and it has always seemed to me a marvelous evidence of divine knowledge that so many centuries before physicists discovered these things, the "absurd idea," as it must have appeared for millennia in the past, is so clearly set forth in the Bible that, in addition to the waters stored away in the "deeps" and ocean beds, there is another ocean suspended above the earth.

But further to bring scorn on this "absurd" scientific verity we are referred to Genesis 7: 11, from which we are invited to assure ourselves that the Bible undoubtedly represents heaven as a solid roof, because it is written: "In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened. And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights" (vs. 11, 12).

If the writer who calls attention to this matter were a little better acquainted with the proofs presented by great geologists in support of the universal tradition, among all peoples, of the Deluge, and that this swamping of the earth with water was caused by a breaking up or dislocation of the land and ocean levels combined with the precipitation upon the globe of some of the billions of tons of water in suspension above it, he would marvel at the combined vivid metaphor and scientific accuracy to be found in those statements. In no book but the Bible would such apt and obvious imagery as the "windows of heaven" cause any comment but that of admiration.

The temptation is to comment on everything presented by the atheists, because an argument for the Bible may be framed out of nearly every one of them; but this would be unprofitable. The foolish argument based on the fact that the English translators thought the hare was the animal indicated by the Hebrew word *arnebeth*, which *arnebeth* is referred to as chewing the cud, suggests that of Voltaire, who contended that Solomon could not have written the Proverbs attributed to him because he warns against the wine that giveth its color aright in the glass, which Voltaire asserts, contrary to much evidence, was not in existence in Solomon's time, but whose contention evaporates when the fact is brought forth that the Hebrew word freely translated "the

glass" in the French version he used means merely a drinking cup. Voltaire, as possibly even the atheists know, predicted that arguments like his would make the Bible an obsolete curiosity in a few years, and it is in Voltaire's very house in which this boast was made that a Bible Society prints and distributes millions of copies of the book he attacked. Why do not the atheists heed the lesson of history, and the sage and homely advice of Benjamin Franklin to Tom Paine when he proposed to publish his "Age of Reason," that he refrain because "He that spitteth against the wind spitteth in his own face"?

Our atheist author continues:

Most true prophecies were written after the event. The Bible ends with an unfulfilled prophecy.

If only a few of the "true prophecies" of the Bible were written before the event, the atheist has a problem to solve which will unseat his reason if he reject the Christian's solution. As to his other contention, every prophecy is unfulfilled when it is delivered or it would be history, not prophecy. The longer between the prediction and the fulfillment, the more marvelous the phenomenon when it is fulfilled. That of the destruction of Jerusalem was unfulfilled for sixty years or more, but it was terribly fulfilled then. That of the coming Redeemer was unfulfilled for millennia, but He was born at the exact place and died in the exact manner and in the exact month of the exact year prophesied centuries in advance, as every Bible reader knows or may know. That the wicked shall be turned into hell is still unfulfilled as to those now living, or they would not have the chance they now have to repent and flee from the wrath to come in God's time,—and the earth is full of signs that that time is not long.

Again our author argues:

As a moral code the Commandments are defective. The first four have no moral value. The first three deal with relations to God, not man, etc.

This begs the question. If there were no God, of course commandments which have to do with man's relation to a nonentity would be useless; but since there is one, the dealings of man with his fellow are of small importance compared with his relationship to his Creator, Lord, Judge, and Saviour.

Of course the atheist circular makes the usual strictures upon the acts of immorality recorded in the Bible. Suppose the Bible did not truly set down the sins of the patriarchs, how quickly the infidel would mock at its lack of truthfulness and its "whitewashing" of God's servants and chosen people. But since it does truly narrate the sins which sinful men committed against their holy God, shows how badly humanity needed the divine One who was coming to "save his people

from their sins," and establishes the necessity for the atonement recorded in the New Testament and for the hope held out of a glorious final consummation when the world will be purged of its sin and filled with joy and singing for all eternity, the Bible's faithful record brings the same result of objection from the atheist. God forgives those who repent and seek His pardon, and His mercy is scorned and contemned by the atheist; finally He condemns and executes righteous judgment, and His justice is equally objectionable.

The patriarchs did sin, "even as you and I," and it is obvious that if God were to reveal Himself or deal with mankind at all He would have to use men as they were. Full of shortcomings as Abraham and David and Noah were, there is little room for doubt that they were far and away the best men and the best material for God's use then available—and proper humility may suggest the further addition, or available even now. If sins on their part, even though forsaken and deeply repented of, made them wholly unavailable for God's use as instruments or illustrations of both His righteousness and His mercy, then for the same reason every man of every generation including the present would be unavailable for God's use, and a revelation from God to man would be impossible either by word or deed.

And it is obvious how much more illuminating and helpful to all succeeding generations is the very irregularity of the lives of the patriarchs, as both their integrity and their iniquity called for the exercise of the many and different qualities of our perfect deity—His judgment, His mercy, His punishment, His blessing, His severity, and His loving-kindness and tender mercy all being called forth and exercised by the varying qualities and acts of those who were fortunate enough to be the objects of both His chastening and His comforting. David did sin unspeakably, and the Lord's prophet told him that he had given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme. But what comfort there is to us poor sinners of today as we read that when, in response to the moving presentation of his guilt by the prophet Nathan, David immediately humbled himself before his God and his prophet and confessed "I have sinned," the assurance from God came back to David almost on the echo of his confession, "The Lord also hath put away thy sin"! Simon Peter did play the poltroon and coward in denying the Lord he loved; but what assurance there is to us of today, who with so much less provocation deny Him by our worldly lives and traitorous dallying with His enemy, that the risen Lord sent to Peter the only personal and individual invitation to meet Him in Galilee.

God maketh the wrath of man to praise Him, and if it were not for such things as this in the Word, many of us poor sinners today would not dare to entertain the assured hope we have of pardon and everlasting life for ourselves. A God who is both infinitely merciful and righteously just is exactly the kind of god even an atheist should long for. And the God of the Bible manifests Himself as such a deity, even though to do so makes it necessary for Him to suffer the penalty of His

broken law in His own person and Son. Surely every man who learns that, at the heart of the universe and the constellations and the spiral nebulae, and sustaining all things by the word of His power is, not a blind force, but such a God as that, should find his heart joining in the great chorus of thanksgiving: "Alleluia; salvation, and glory, and honour, and power, unto the Lord our God: for true and righteous are his judgments. . . . Alleluia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. . . . Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him."

To return to our poor atheist. He cites as an illustration of the barbarity of this Book, whose entrance into every land for some reason has been marked by the coincidence of the founding of the first orphan asylums, hospitals, and institutions of mercy ever known to those heathen countries, before that as free from its influence as he would like to see our own land become, the following: "Children should be beaten with rods." Proverbs 23: 14.

Looking up this citation, one is struck by several other contiguous verses whose beauty it would seem that even the blind mind of an atheist would see. Here they are (Prov. 23: 10-15):

Remove not the old landmark; and enter not into the fields of the fatherless:

For their redeemer is mighty; he shall plead their cause with thee:

Apply thine heart unto instruction, and thine ears to the words of knowledge.

Withhold not correction from the child: for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die.

Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell.

My son, if thine heart be wise, my heart shall rejoice, even mine.

One reason for the moral and intellectual force which has made the Scotch about the most respected race on earth, whether in war, where the indomitable courage of the kilted Highlanders earned them from their foes the title, "The ladies from hell," or in scholarship, statesmanship, or theology, is said to be that for generations the Proverbs of Solomon have been used as the primer from which this race learned to read—and to think. Solomon's advice about sparing the rod and spoiling the child has been followed in Scotland, and the results would seem to have been better than the contrary system of the present day which has filled the jails with boyish brigands, criminal girls, and a juvenile race so lawless that kidnaping is merely an adventure, and murder an experiment in psychology.

The atheist speaks of the God of the Bible as "assassinating" certain people whom He caused to die, and in using this word he does not go far beyond the expression of a famous author and Modernist missionary

whose recorded address at a Y. M. C. A. convention contains these words:

A mother was talking to her little child of the murder of the Amalekites. She explained that in those days enemies were murdered, but revelation was progressive, and Jesus told us that we were to love our enemies and do good to them that despitefully use us. Said the little girl: "Now I understand: that day was before God became a Christian."

This moving story was supposed to shed a flood of light on the deep problem presented by the Bible because at different times and under varying circumstances God shows forth different aspects of His complete and perfect being. To many of us this seems to present no more of a problem than does the fact that it is the same George Washington who so tenderly loved his little stepchild "Patsy" and later his grand-stepchildren Nellie Custis and her brother, and who is depicted in a famous painting with Betsy Ross' little daughter perched on his knee, yet who directed the deadly fire against the British at Germantown and Yorktown. And is it not self-evident that even a man is the more, not the less perfect, because he is at one time as stern and deadly in defense of his country and the right as he is at another tender and merciful toward those dependent upon him or seeking his pardon for a wrong?

A former associate of mine, Charles Fahy, now United States Solicitor General, was "of counsel" for a Chinese named Wan who, after many years of trial and imprisonment, was finally released as a result of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States that a confession from him largely figuring in his conviction was not secured under such conditions as to make it admissible in evidence. This friend spent many months of harrowing labor presenting every error he could find for reversal by the appellate courts. One "error" he did not allege. He nowhere in his brief argued that to execute this alleged murderer would be to assassinate him, and that for the judge to sentence him to death and direct the sheriff to execute the sentence would be to murder him. Has not the God who made and rules mankind as much right to direct the execution of a man or a nation that has broken His laws, and whose "cup of iniquity" after patient forbearance at length is full, as a mortal has to direct the execution of a fellow man who has broken man-made laws? Archeology and ancient history give us such a record of beastly impurities and cruelties practiced by these condemned nations, who skinned their captives and burned their children in the arms of red-hot idols, that there would almost seem to be more reason for the atheist to criticize God for His mercy than for His judgment. But then, His mercy is equally abhorrent to the atheist, who complains as bitterly of God's forgiveness to David and to others who seek His pardon as he does of His final judgment upon those who do not.

Again, under the heading "Injustice to Women" (Federated Clubwomen, please note), some verses are cited which it is evidently hoped will incite our mothers, sisters, wives, and maiden aunts, "once our superiors, now our equals," to an uprising against the helpless and dependent males of their families—and how dependent we are no man knows until one of these relations is sick in bed for a day. Among the verses cited with incendiary intent is:

Col. 3: 18. (Verse 19 is not cited, for an obvious reason.)

18. Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord.

19. Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them.

I do not recall any instance in which Paul counsels wives to defer to their husbands that he does not immediately couple this injunction with one to the husband to love his wife. And is there any normal, womanly woman alive who is not glad to follow Paul's advice with regard to a husband who loves her more than his own life, so that the practical effect is to produce the idyllic happiness of so many Christian homes, where the husband is the formal head of the house which is really under the delightful and loving despotism of the wife and mother? Max O'Rell declared that a woman would look up to a man if she had to sit down to do it, and we freely admit that this maneuver is almost invariably necessary on their part, so that these verses only show the Bible's familiarity with the psychology of the two sexes that God made so capable of bestowing happiness each upon the other.

Another verse cited in illustration of the Bible's injustice to women is Ephesians 5: 24 and another verse omitted is Ephesians 5: 26.

Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything.

Husbands, love your wives, *even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it.*

Even though my own wife is one of the "Federated Clubwomen" to whom this inflammatory manifesto of the atheist is directed, I feel sure that my manly right to earn the living and pay the taxes and carve the duck and hunt the burglar and fight the mouse will not be wrested from me by the girl whose dimples some years back showed how willingly she promised to make me a "loving and dutiful" wife.

Another sentence under this heading is evidently intended to lead the uninformed reader to believe that the God of the Bible authorized His people to deal with captive women after the manner of the Nazis and Turks with the captured women. Here is the sentence:

Have they not divided the prey; to every man a damsel or two . . . ? Deborah. Judges 5: 30. Did you ever hear a sermon on that text?

When we turn to Judges we find that Deborah, in her triumphant song celebrating the death of the heathen Sisera, Israel's great enemy, mocked at him and imagined his heathen mother as saying the words quoted:

The mother of Sisera looked out at a window, and cried through the lattice, Why is his chariot so long in coming? why tarry the wheels of his chariots? Her wise ladies answered her, yea, she returned answer to herself, Have they not sped? have they not divided the prey; to every man a damsel or two; to Sisera a prey of divers colors . . . ?

Does it not seem that even an atheist would have better judgment than to put into the hands of his opponent such a weapon with which to illustrate his lack of good faith in asking why a Christian preacher has never preached upon the suppositious text of this heathen woman?

Again we have the heavy type heading:

Human Sacrifice (Ku Klux Klan, please note).

God gives law governing human sacrifice. Lev. 27: 28, 29. Jer. 7: 30, 31.

In the chapter first referred to we find God providing the rules under which His people might have the joy of making gifts, whether of lands, animals, or personal service to Him, and since the atheist author himself cites in this connection Jeremiah 7: 30, 31, it is hard to believe that even he thinks that the God of the Bible directs human sacrifice. The verses from Jeremiah read:

For the children of Judah have done evil in my sight, saith the Lord: they have set their abominations in the house which is called by my name, to pollute it.

And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart.

Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter: for they shall bury in Tophet, till there be no place.

The God of the Bible states that it never came into His heart for His people to sacrifice their children, and because they did so they were to be punished with a great slaughter. And this is cited by the atheists in proof that God does in the Bible direct and approve human sacrifice! Surely a brain full of atheism is a fearful and wonderful thing! Yet these circulars, so mixed with truth, falsity, sound reasoning from false

facts and unsound reasoning from true facts, are in the hands of thousands of school children and cause thousands of college boys and their elders to cast aside the Bible of their fathers!

Again: "A strain of cannibalism appears in the Bible." In support are cited the terrible warnings to the Jews that if (or rather *when*, for the God of the Bible foreknew their history) they forsook their God and His holy and merciful and just commandments, punishment would come upon them from their enemies, who would besiege them till they ate their own children—an instance of which is recorded by Josephus as well as in the Bible. Voltaire somewhere makes the same charge of cannibalism against the Jews, and cites in support a verse which foretells a great battle by addressing to the vultures a promise to give them the flesh of mighty men and captains to eat! Surely there is something wrong with a case which calls for such proofs to support it!

Sarcastic comment is made upon the provision God made to protect the men of His chosen people from the pangs, and the women from the injustice, of unfounded jealousy. The stern sentence of death was pronounced against the wife who did her husband a worse injury than death in being unfaithful to him and introducing, as only the woman's unfaithfulness to her vows could introduce, the incurable discord and doubt of uncertain paternity into family life. But that was a stern day, with a stern law that obtained in full force for many centuries afterward; and any lawyer who remembers the tragedy and agony and insanity which the suspicion of marital infidelity introduces into domestic relations today will wish that God's providence even now provided a way in which, through a simple formula of drinking bitter herbs with the solemn injunction by the priest to tell the truth, a wife tempted to guilt might fear her sin would be uncovered, and an innocent wife might be cleared by God's interposition from the injustice and agony of being suspected of a wrong.

It would not pay to spend more time on the dozens of other arguments against the Bible presented by this successor and heir of the ideas and arguments of all bygone infidels, some of which require more time and space and more abstruse consideration than can be had here, but all of which have been answered to the utter satisfaction of the most saintly, scholarly, and logical men who have lived and devoted their lives to the study of the Bible. But one more sample of infidel argumentation will be considered. It is presented under the heavy type heading "Cruelty," and a sentence under this topic reads:

Robbing birds' nests ordered to lengthen life. Deut. 22: 6, 7.

In referring to this section, as the writer evidently never expected his reader to do, another verse or two close to it are worth noting for the beauty which the "jaundiced eye" of atheism cannot see.

Deuteronomy 22: 1. Thou shalt not see thy brother's ox or his

sheep go astray, and hide thyself from them: thou shalt in any case bring them again unto thy brother. (And in another place the Jew is commanded to show the same courtesy even if the straying animal belongs to one who hates him.)

Deuteronomy 22: 6, 7. If a bird's nest chance to be before thee in the way in any tree, or on the ground, whether they be young ones, or eggs, and the dam sitting upon the young, or upon the eggs, thou shalt not take the dam with the young: but thou shalt in any wise let the dam go, and take the young to thee; that it may be well with thee, and that thou mayest prolong thy days.

The tender sentiment in many Old Testament laws, under which it is ordered that "thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honour the face of the old man, and fear thy God: I am the Lord"; that "thou shalt not oppress a stranger . . . seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt"; that the corners of the field should not be reaped but left for the widow and fatherless; that a kid should not be seethed in its mother's milk; and in this law, which did not allow a Jew to catch and eat a mother bird whose devotion to her young made her linger upon her nest, is one of the most endearing things about the Old Testament, loved by Jew and Gentile alike. The command is not necessarily to eat the young or the eggs which, if partly hatched as contemplated here, would, of course, be inedible, but that if the young were taken for food (as many a squab has been so taken by me) the self-sacrifice of the mother bird should not be used to capture and eat her too. Such laws confirm the induction from the beauty of sunset and field and flower, and the tender joys and emotions of which the brains, hearts, and bodies of human beings are capable, that we have the good fortune to have in the God of nature and of the Bible not only a being of infinite power, justice, and love, but one of the tenderest sentiment and feeling—as further illustrated by the sympathetic tears of the Lord Jesus, who wept with His sorrowing friends at the grave of Lazarus, even though He intended in a few minutes to turn their sorrow into joy.

Considering a bit further this alleged command "to rob birds' nests to prolong life," I am reminded of a story of the late George Henry Corliss, who is said to have delayed the building of an addition to the plant where the world's greatest steam engines are built until a robin had finished raising her brood, evidently under the malign influence of such a Bible text as this. It so happened that Corliss lived to a good old age in the enjoyment of great wealth and honor. The words are, "That it may be well with thee, and that thou mayest prolong thy days."

This may have been a mere coincidence, but when it is remembered that John H. Converse, and John Wanamaker, and Huyler, and Colgate, and Marshall Field, all lived their lives and conducted their business according to the rules of this old Book, and that they each and all at-

tained fame, fortune, and length of days, it might appear that, in taking seriously the statement of the Bible, "This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein: for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success," the foolishness of these Christians was wiser than the wisdom of the atheist. For, corroborating this conclusion from the other angle, is the fact that our jails are at this moment filled with young evolutionary atheists whose deliverance from all superstitious reverence for the rules of life and success laid down in the Bible seems to have been a contributing cause to the fact that the time of their premature departure from this world has been fixed by a judge and the details entrusted to a sheriff, so that they have attained neither wealth, fame, success, nor length of days.

The wealthy, brilliant, courageous young favorite of King Charles II, the Earl of Rochester, declared during his last illness that all the pleasures of sin that he had indulged in, with facilities for indulgence rarely equalled since the days when King Solomon declared all worldly pleasures to be vanity and emptiness and weariness, would not compensate for five minutes of the mental agony he experienced at the contemplation of death without the Christian's hope of pardon and life. With these things before us, does there not seem to be some justification for the declaration of that able lawyer, Saul of Tarsus, that "godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come"? And does not the consideration of these few samples of the best arguments atheism can bring against the Bible shed some light on the statement of David Nelson, heretofore quoted, that one of the two things which made him a Christian was his reading of infidel books in search of good grounds for his unbelief?

—I. H. LINTON, by permission of *Sunday School Times*.

APPENDIX "H"

TRIAL OF THE WITNESSES

(To be read when not in a hurry.)

IN the course of my sort of archeological literary researches I have often come across such profound and able writings of a century or two ago that I have been tempted to wish that the world's literary strata might be reversed as the rocks have been in some places—to the great confusion of some geologists who still cling to Lyell's "Onion Skin" theory—and these writings might be read instead of those of recent date. One such find was the report by Thomas Sherlock, D. D., Bishop of London, first published about the year 1729, of what was or purported to be a most skillful debate between a Christian and an Infidel lawyer, in the presence of a judge and jury of fellow lawyers of the "Inns of Court" about the evidence in support of the alleged fact of the resurrection of Christ. The plausible skill with which the lawyer for infidelity presents the case against Christian faith is only bettered by the ability and logical force with which the attorney for Christianity answers it. There is nothing more gripping than a skillfully fought law trial between able and learned lawyers, and it is believed that the careful reading of Sherlock's "Trial of the Witnesses" will give anyone so reading it the comfortable assurance that he knows the utmost that can be said against the proof of the central fact of our faith and also how utterly every such attack can be met and answered. Many times the statement is made rather glibly that the resurrection of Christ is the best proved fact in history. It is indeed so, but probably many of those making this statement could not justify it if called on to do so. After reading what follows anyone should.

We were, not long since, some gentlemen of the Inns of Court together, each to the other so well known, that no man's presence was a confinement to any other, from speaking his mind on any subject that happened to arise in conversation. The meeting was without design, and the discourse, as in like cases, various. Among other things we fell on the subject of Woolston's trial and conviction, which had happened some few days before. That led to a debate, How the law stands in such cases? what punishment it inflicts? and, in general, whether the law ought at all to interpose in controversies of this kind? We were not agreed in these points. One, who maintained the favourable side to Woolston, discovered a great liking and approbation of his discourses against the miracles of Christ, and seemed to think his arguments un-

answerable. To which another replied, I wonder that one of your abilities, and bred to the profession of the law, which teaches us to consider the nature of evidence, and its proper weight, can be of that opinion: I am sure you would be unwilling to determine a property of five shillings on such evidence as you now think material enough to overthrow the miracles of Christ.

It may easily be imagined that this opened a door to much dispute, and determined the conversation for the remainder of the evening to this subject. The dispute ran through almost all the particulars mentioned in Woolston's pieces; but the thread of it was broken by several digressions, and the pursuit of things which were brought accidentally into the discourse. At length one of the company said pleasantly, Gentlemen, you do not argue like lawyers; if I were judge in this case, I would hold you better to the point. The company took the hint, and cried, they should be glad to have the cause reheard, and him to be the judge. The gentlemen who had engaged with mettle and spirit in a dispute which arose accidentally seemed very unwilling to be drawn into a formal controversy; and especially the gentleman who argued against Woolston thought the matter grew too serious for him, and excused himself from undertaking a controversy in religion, of all others the most momentous. But he was told that the argument should be confined merely to the nature of the evidence; and that might be considered, without entering into any such controversy as he would avoid; and, to bring the matter within bounds, and under one view, the evidence of Christ's resurrection, and the exceptions taken to it, should be the only subject of the conference. With much persuasion he suffered himself to be persuaded, and promised to give the company, and their new-made judge, a meeting that day fortnight. The judge and the rest of the company were for bringing on the cause a week sooner; but the counsel for Woolston took the matter up, and said, Consider, sir, the gentleman is not to argue out of Littleton, Plowden, or Coke, authors to him well known; but he must have his authorities from Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; and a fortnight is time little enough of all conscience to gain a familiarity with a new acquaintance; and, turning to the gentleman, he said, I will call on you before the fortnight is out, to see how reverend an appearance you make behind Hammond on the New Testament, a concordance on one hand, and a folio Bible with references on the other. You shall be welcome, sir, replied the gentleman; and perhaps you may find some company more to your own taste. He is but a poor counsel who studies one side of the question only; and, therefore, I will have your friends Woolston, Tindal, and Collins to entertain you when you do me the favour of the visit.

On this we parted in good humour, and all pleased with the appointment made, except the two gentlemen who were to provide the entertainment.

THE SECOND DAY

The company met at the time appointed: but it happened in this, as in like cases it often does, that some friends to some of the company, who were not of the party the first day, had got notice of the meeting; and the gentlemen who were to debate the question found they had a more numerous audience than they expected or desired. . . . On which one of the company, smiling, said, It happens luckily that our number is increased: when we were last together, we appointed a judge, but we quite forgot a jury; and now, I think, we are good men and true, sufficient to make one. This thought was pursued in several allusions to legal proceedings; which created some mirth, and had this good effect, that it dispersed the solemn air, which the mutual compliments on the difficulty before mentioned had introduced, and restored the ease and good humour natural to the conversation of gentlemen.

The Judge, perceiving the disposition of the company, thought it a proper time to begin, and called out, Gentlemen of the jury, take your places; and immediately seated himself at the upper end of the table. The company sat round him, and the judge called on the counsel for Woolston to begin.

Mr. A., counsel for Woolston, addressing himself to the judge, said: May it please your Lordship, I conceive the gentleman on the other side ought to begin, and lay his evidence, which he intends to maintain, before the court; till that is done, it is to no purpose for me to object. I may perhaps object to something which he will not admit to be any part of his evidence; and therefore I apprehend, the evidence ought in the first place to be distinctly stated.

Judge. *Mr. B.*, what say you to that?

Mr. B., counsel on the other side. My Lord, if the evidence I am to maintain were to support any new claim—if I were to gain anything which I am not already possessed of—the gentleman would be in the right: but the evidence is old, and is matter of record; and I have been long in possession of all that I claim under it. If the gentleman has anything to say to dispossess me, let him produce it; otherwise I have no reason to bring my own title into question. And this I take to be the known method of proceeding in such cases: no man is obliged to produce his title to his possession; it is sufficient if he maintains it when it is called in question.

Mr. A. Surely, my Lord, the gentleman mistakes the case. I can never admit myself to be out of possession of my understanding and reason, and since he would put me out of this possession, and compel me to admit things incredible, in virtue of the evidence he maintains, he ought to set forth his claim, or leave the world to be directed by common sense.

Judge. Sir, you say right, on supposition that the truth of the Christian religion were the point in judgment. In that case it would be necessary to produce the evidence for the Christian religion. But the matter now before the court is, whether the objections produced by

Mr. Woolston are of weight to overthrow the evidence of Christ's resurrection? You see then the evidence of the resurrection is supposed to be what it is on both sides; and the thing immediately in judgment is, the value of the objections; and therefore they must be set forth. The court will be bound to take notice of the evidence, which is admitted as a fact on both parts. Go on, Mr. A.

Mr. A. My Lord, I submit to the direction of the court. I cannot but observe, that the gentleman on the other side, unwilling as he seems to be to state his evidence, did not forget to lay in his claim to prescription; which is perhaps, in truth, though he has too much skill to own it, the very strength of his cause. I do allow, that the gentleman maintains nothing, but what his father and grandfather, and his ancestors, beyond time of man's memory, maintained before him: I allow, too, that prescription in many cases makes a good title; but it must always be with this condition, that the thing is capable of being prescribed for: and I insist, that prescription cannot run against reason and common sense. Customs may be pleaded by prescription; but if, upon shewing the custom, any thing unreasonable appears in it, the prescription fails; for length of time works nothing towards the establishing any thing that could never have a legal commencement. And if this objection will overthrow all prescriptions for customs, the mischief of which extends perhaps to one poor village only, and affects them in no greater concern than their right of common on a ragged mountain; shall it not much more prevail, when the interest of mankind is concerned, and in no less a point than his happiness in this life, and in all his hopes for futurity? Besides, if prescription must be allowed in this case, how will you deal with it in others? What will you say to the ancient Persians, and their fire-altars? nay, what to the Turks, who have been long enough in possession of their faith to plead—

Mr. B. I beg pardon for interrupting the gentleman. But it is to save him trouble. He is going into his favourite commonplace, and has brought us from Persia to Turkey already; and if he goes on, I know we must follow him round the globe. To save us from this long journey, I will waive all advantage from the antiquity of the resurrection, and the general reception the belief of it has found in the world; and am content to consider it as a fact which happened but last year, and was never heard of either by the gentleman's grandfather, or by mine.

Mr. A. I should not have taken quite so long a journey as the gentleman imagines; nor, indeed, need any man go far from home to find instances to the purpose I was on. But, since this advantage is quitted, I am as willing to spare my pains, as the gentleman is desirous that I should. And yet I suspect some art even in this concession, fair and candid as it seems to be. For I am persuaded, that one reason, perhaps the main reason, why men believe this history of Jesus, is, that they cannot conceive that any one should attempt, much less succeed in such an attempt as this, on the foundation of mere human

cunning and policy; and it is worth the while to go round the globe, as the gentleman expressed himself, to see various instances of the like kind, in order to remove this prejudice. But I stand corrected, and will go directly to the point now in judgment.

Mr. B. My Lord, the gentleman, in justification of his first argument, has entered on another of a very different kind. I think he is sensible of it, and seeming to yield up one of his popular topics, is indeed artfully getting rid of another, which has made a very good figure in many late writings, but will not bear in any place where he who maintains it may be asked questions. The mere antiquity of the resurrection I gave up; for, if the evidence was not good at first, it cannot be good now. The gentleman is willing, he says, to spare us his history of ancient errors; and intimates, that on this account he passes over many instances of fraud, that were like in circumstances to the case before us. By no means, my Lord, let them be passed over. I would not have the main strength of his cause betrayed in complaisance to me. Nothing can be more material than to shew a fraud of this kind, that prevailed universally in the world. Christ Jesus declared himself a Prophet, and put the proof of his mission on this, that he should die openly and publicly, and rise again the third day. This surely was the hardest plot in the world to be managed; and if there be one instance of this kind, or in any degree like it, by all means let it be produced.

Mr. A. My Lord, there has hardly been an instance of a false religion in the world, but it has also afforded a like instance to this before us. Have they not all pretended to inspiration? Upon what foot did Pythagoras, Numa, and others, set up? Did they not all converse with the gods, and pretend to deliver oracles?

Mr. B. This only shews, that revelation is by the common consent of mankind the very best foundation of religion; and therefore every impostor pretends to it. But is a man's hiding himself in a cave for some years, and then coming out into the world, to be compared to a man's dying, and rising to life again? So far from it, that you and I and every man may do the one, but no man can do the other.

Mr. A. Sir, I suppose it will be allowed to be as great a thing to go to heaven, and converse with angels, and with God, and to come down to the earth again, as it is to die, and rise again? Now, this very thing Mahomet pretended to do; and all his disciples believe it. Can you deny this fact?

Mr. B. Deny it, sir? No. But tell us who went with Mahomet? Who were his witnesses? I expect, before we have done, to hear of the guards set over the sepulchre of Christ, and the seal of the stone. What guard watched Mahomet in his going or returning? What seals and credentials had he? He himself pretends to none. His followers pretend to nothing but his own word. We are now to consider the evidence of Christ's resurrection, and you think to parallel it, by producing a case for which no one ever pretended there was any evidence. You have Mahomet's word; and no man ever told a lie, but you had

his word for the truth of what he said: and therefore you need not go round the globe to find such instances as these. But this story, it is said, has gained great credit, and is received by many nations. Very well. And how was it received? Was not every man converted to this faith with the sword at his throat? In our case, every witness to the resurrection, and every believer of it, was hourly exposed to death. In the other case, whoever refused to believe, died; or, what was as bad, lived a wretched conquered slave. And will you pretend these cases to be alike? One case, indeed, there was, within our own memory, which, in some circumstances, came near to the case now before us. The French prophets put the credit of their mission on the resurrection of Dr. Emmes, and gave public notice of it. If the gentleman pleases to make use of this instance, it is at his service.

Mr. A. The instance of Dr. Emmes is so far to the purpose, that it shews to what lengths enthusiasm will carry men. And why might not the same thing happen at Jerusalem, which happened but a few years ago in our own country? Matthew and John and the rest of them, managed that affair with more dexterity than the French prophets; so that the resurrection of Jesus gained credit in the world, and the French prophets sank under their ridiculous pretensions. That is all the difference.

Mr. B. Is it so? And a very wide difference, I promise you. In one case, everything happened that was proper to convince the world of the truth of the resurrection; in the other, the event manifested the cheat; and on the view of these circumstances, you think it sufficient to say, with great coolness, that is all the difference. Why, what difference do you expect between truth and falsehood? What distinction—

Judge. Gentlemen, you forget that you are in a court, and are falling into dialogue. Courts do not allow of chit-chat. Look ye, the evidence of the resurrection of Jesus is before the court, recorded by Matthew, Mark, and others. You must take it as it is; you can neither make it better nor worse. These witnesses are accused of giving false evidence. Come to the point; and let us hear what you have to offer to prove the accusation.

Mr. B. Is it your meaning, sir, that the objections should be stated and argued all together, and that the answer should be to the whole at once? or would you have the objections argued singly, and answered separately by themselves?

Judge. I think this court may dispense with the strict forms of legal proceedings; and therefore I leave this to the choice of the jury.

After the jury had consulted together, the foreman rose up.

The foreman of the Jury. We desire to hear the objections argued and answered separately. We shall be better able to form a judgment, by hearing the answer whilst the objection is fresh in our minds.

Judge. Gentlemen, you hear the opinion of the jury. Go on.

Mr. A. I am now to disclose to you a scene, of all others the most surprising. "The resurrection has been long talked of, and, to the

amazement of every one who can think freely, has been believed through all ages of the Church." ¹ This general and constant belief creates in most minds a presumption that it was founded on good evidence. In other cases the evidence supports the credit of the history; but here the evidence itself is presumed only on the credit which the story has gained. I wish the books dispersed against Jesus by the ancient Jews had not been lost; for they would have given us a clear insight into this contrivance: ² but it is happy for us, that the very account given by the pretended witnesses of this fact, is sufficient to destroy the credit of it.

The resurrection was not a thing contrived for its own sake. No! it was undertaken to support great views, and for the sake of great consequences that were to attend it. It will be necessary, therefore, to lay before you these views, that you may the better judge of this part of the contrivance, when you have the whole scene before you.

The Jews were a weak superstitious people, and, as is common among such people, gave great credit to some traditionary prophecies about their own country. They had, besides, some old books among them, which they esteemed to be writings of certain prophets, whose memory they had in great veneration. From such old books and traditions they formed many extravagant expectations; and among the rest one was, that some time or other a great victorious prince should rise among them, and subdue all their enemies, and make them lords of the world. In Augustus's time they were in a low state, reduced under the Roman yoke; and as they never wanted a deliverer more, so the eagerness of this hope, as it happens to weak minds, turned into a firm expectation that he would soon come. ³ This proved a temptation to some bold, and to some cunning men, to personate the prince so much expected. And "nothing is more natural and common to promote rebellions, than to ground them on new prophecies, or new interpretations of old ones; prophecies being suited to the vulgar superstition, and operating with the force of religion." ⁴ Accordingly many such impostors rose, pretending to be the victorious prince expected; and they, and the people who followed them, perished in the folly of their attempt.

But Jesus, knowing that victories and triumphs are not things to be counterfeited; that the people were not to be delivered from the Roman yoke by sleight of hand; and having no hope of being able to cope with the Emperor of Rome in good earnest, took another and more successful method to carry on His design. He took upon Him to be the prince foretold in the ancient prophets; but then He insisted, that the true sense of the prophecies had been mistaken; that they related not to the kingdoms of this world, but to the kingdom of heaven; that the Messiah was not to be a conquering prince, but a suffering one; that He was not to come with horses of war, and chariots of war, but

¹ Sixth Discourse, p. 17.

² Sixth Discourse, p. 4.

³ See "Scheme of Literal Prophecy," p. 26.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

was to be meek and lowly, and riding on an ass. By this means He got the common and necessary foundation for a new revelation, which is to be built and founded on a precedent revelation.¹

To carry on this design, He made choice of twelve men of no fortunes or education, and of such understandings, as gave no jealousy that they would discover the plot. And, what is most wonderful, and shews their ability, whilst the master was preaching the kingdom of heaven, these poor men, not weaned from the prejudices of their country, expected every day that He would declare Himself a king, and were quarreling who should be His first minister. This expectation had a good effect on the service; for it kept them constant to their master.

I must observe farther, that the Jews were under strange apprehensions of supernatural powers; and as their own religion was founded on the belief of certain miracles said to be wrought by their lawgiver Moses; so were they ever running after wonders and miracles, and ready to take up with any stories of this kind. Now, as something extraordinary was necessary to support the pretensions of Jesus, He dexterously laid hold on this weakness of the people, and set up to be a wonder-worker. His disciples were well qualified to receive this impression; they saw, or thought they saw, many strange things, and were able to spread the fame and report of them abroad.

This conduct had the desired success. The whole country was alarmed and full of the news of a great prophet's being come among them. They were too full of their own imagination, to attend to the notion of a kingdom of heaven. Here was one mighty in deed and in word; and they concluded He was the very prince their nation expected. Accordingly they once attempted to set Him up for a king; and at another time attended Him in triumph to Jerusalem. This natural consequence opens the natural design of the attempt. If things had gone on successfully to the end, it is probable the kingdom of heaven would have been changed into a kingdom of this world. The design indeed failed, by the impatience and over-hastiness of the multitude; which alarmed not only the chief of the Jews, but the Roman governor also.

The case being come to this point, and Jesus, seeing that He could not escape being put to death, He declared, that the ancient prophets had foretold, that the Messiah should die upon a cross, and that He should rise again on the third day. Here was the foundation laid for the continuing this plot, which otherwise had died with its author. This was His legacy to His followers; which, having been well managed by them and their successors, has at last produced a kingdom indeed; a kingdom of priests, who have governed the world for many ages, and have been strong enough to set kings and emperors at defiance. But so it happens, the ancient prophets appealed to are still extant; and there being no such prophecies of the death and resurrection of the Messiah, they are a standing evidence against this story. As He expected, so it hap-

¹ See "Discourse of the Grounds," etc., ch. iv.

pened, that He died on a cross; and the prosecuting of this contrivance was left to the management of His disciples and followers. Their part is next to be considered—

Mr. B. My Lord, since it is your opinion that the objections should be considered singly, and the gentleman has carried his scheme down to the death of Christ, I think he is come to a proper rest; and that it is agreeable to your intention that I should be admitted to answer.

Judge. You say right, sir. Let us hear what you answer to this charge.

Mr. B. My Lord, I was unwilling to disturb the gentleman by breaking in on his scheme; otherwise I should have reminded him that this court sits to examine evidence, and not to be entertained with fine imaginations. You have had a scheme laid before you, but not one bit of evidence to support any part of it; no, not so much as a pretence to any evidence. The gentleman, I remember, was very sorry that the old books of the Jews were lost, which would, as he supposes, have set forth all this matter; and I agree with him, that he has much reason to be sorry, considering his great scarcity of proof. And since I have mentioned this, that I may not be to return to it again, I would ask the gentleman now, how he knows there ever were such books? And since, if ever there were any, they are lost, how he knows what they contained? I doubt I shall have frequent occasion to ask such questions. It would indeed be a sufficient answer to the whole, to repeat the several suppositions that have been made, and to call for the evidence on which they stand. This would plainly discover every part of the story to be mere fiction. But since the gentleman seems to have endeavoured to bring under one view the many insinuations which have of late been spread abroad by different hands, and to work the whole into a consistent scheme, I will, if your patience shall permit, examine this plot, and see to whom the honour of the contrivance belongs.

The gentleman begins with expressing his "amazement that the resurrection has been believed in all ages of the church." If you ask him why? he must answer, because the account of it is a forgery; for it is no amazement to him, surely, that a true account should be generally well received. So that this remark proceeds indeed from confidence rather than amazement; and comes only to this, that he is sure there was no resurrection. And I am sure this is no evidence that there was none. Whether he is mistaken in his confidence, or I in mine, the court must judge.

The gentleman's observation, that the general belief of the resurrection creates a presumption that it stands on good evidence, and therefore people look no farther, but follow their fathers, as their fathers did their grandfathers before them, is in great measure true; but it is a truth nothing to his purpose. He allows that the resurrection has been believed in all ages of the church; that is, from the very time of the resurrection: what then prevailed with those who first received it? They certainly did not follow the example of their fathers. Here then is the

point, how did this fact gain credit in the world at first? Credit it has gained without doubt. If the multitude at present go into this belief through prejudice, example, and for company sake, they do in this case no more, nor otherwise, than they do in all cases. And it cannot be denied, but that truth may be received through prejudice (as it is called), that is, without examining the proof, or merits of the cause, as well as falsehood. What general truth is there, the merits of which all the world, or the hundredth part, has examined? It is smartly said somewhere that the priest only continues what the nurse began. But the life of the remark consists in the quaintness of the antithesis between the *nurse* and the *priest*; and owes its support much more to sound than to sense. For is it possible that children should not hear something of the common and popular opinions of their country, whether those opinions be true or false? Do they not learn the common maxims of reason this way? Perhaps every man first learned from his nurse that two and two make four; and whenever she divides an apple among her children, she instills into them this prejudice, that the whole is equal to its parts, and all the parts equal to the whole: and yet Sir Isaac Newton (shame on him!), what work has he made, what a building has he erected on the foundation of this nursery-learning? As to religion, there never was a religion, there never will be one whether true or false, publicly owned in any country, but children have heard, and ever will hear, more or less of it from those who are placed about them. And if this is, and ever must be the case, whether the religion be true or false, it is highly absurd to lay stress on this observation, when the question is about the truth of any religion; for the observation is indifferent to both sides of the question.

We are now, I think, got through the commonplace learning, which must forever, it seems, attend on questions of this nature; and are coming to the merits of the cause.

And here the gentleman on the other side thought proper to begin with an account of the people of the Jews, the people in whose country the fact is laid, and who were originally, and in some respects principally concerned in its consequences.

They were, he says, a weak superstitious people, and lived under the influence of certain pretended prophecies and predictions; that on this ground they had, some time before the appearance of Jesus Christ, conceived great expectations of the coming of a victorious prince, who should deliver them from the Romans. He goes on then to observe, how liable the people were, in this state of things, to be imposed on, and led into rebellion, by anyone who was bold enough to take on him to personate the prince expected. He observes farther that in fact many such impostors did arise, and deceived multitudes to their ruin and destruction.

I have laid these things together, because I do not intend to dispute these matters with the gentleman. Whether the Jews were a weak and superstitious people, and influenced by false prophecies, or whether they

had true prophecies among them, is not material to the present question; it is enough for the gentleman's argument, if I allow the fact to be as he has stated it, that they did expect a victorious prince; that they were on this account exposed to be practised on by pretenders, and in fact were often so deluded.

This foundation being laid, it was natural to expect, and I believe your Lordship and everyone present did expect, that the gentleman would go on to show that Jesus laid hold of this opportunity, struck in with the opinion of the people, and professed Himself to be the prince who was to work their deliverance. But so far, it seems, is this from being the case that the charge on Jesus is that He took the contrary part, and set up on opposition to all the popular notions and prejudices of His country; that He interpreted the prophecies to another sense and meaning than His countrymen did; and by His expositions took away all hopes of their ever seeing the victorious deliverer so much wanted and expected.

I know not how to bring the gentleman's premises and his conclusion to any agreement; they seem to be at a great variance at present. If it be the likeliest method for an impostor to succeed, to build on the popular opinions, prejudices, and prophecies of the people; then surely an impostor cannot possibly take a worse method than to set up on opposition to all the prejudices and prophecies of the country. Where was the art and cunning then of taking this method? Could anything be expected from it but hatred, contempt, and persecution? And did Christ in fact meet with any other treatment from the Jews? And yet when He found, as the gentleman allows He did, that He must perish in this attempt, did He change His note? did He come about, and drop any intimations agreeable to the notions of the people? It is not pretended. This, which, in any other case which ever happened, would be taken to be a plain mark of great honesty, or great stupidity, or of both, is in the present case art, policy, and contrivance.

But, it seems, Jesus dared not set up to be the victorious prince expected, for victories are not to be counterfeited. I hope it was no crime in Him that He did not assume this false character, and try to abuse the credulity of the people: if He had done so, it certainly would have been a crime; and therefore in this point at least He is innocent. I do not suppose the gentleman imagines that the Jews were well founded in their expectation of a temporal prince; and therefore when Christ opposed this conceit at the manifest hazard of His life, as He certainly had truth on His side, so the presumption is, that it was for the sake of truth that He exposed Himself.

No. He wanted, we are told, the common and necessary foundation for a new revelation, the authority of an old one to build on. Very well. I will not inquire how common, or how necessary this foundation is to a new revelation; for, be that case as it will, it is evident that in the method Christ took, He had not, nor could have the supposed advantage of such foundation. For why is this foundation necessary?

A friend of the gentleman's shall tell you, "Because it must be difficult, if not impossible, to introduce among men (who in all civilized countries are bred up in the belief of some revealed religion) a revealed religion wholly new, or such as has no reference to a preceding one; for that would be to combat all men on too many respects, and not to proceed on a sufficient number of principles necessary to be assented to by those on whom the first impressions of a new religion are proposed to be made."¹ You see now the reason of the necessity of this foundation: it is that the new teacher may have the advantage of old popular opinions, and fix himself on the prejudices of the people. Had Christ any such advantages? or did He seek any such? The people expected a victorious prince; He told them they were mistaken: they held as sacred the traditions of the elders; He told them those traditions made the law of God of none effect: they valued themselves for being the peculiar people of God; He told them that people from all quarters of the world should be the people of God, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom: they thought God could be worshipped only at Jerusalem; he told them God might and should be worshipped everywhere: they were superstitious in the observance of the Sabbath; He, according to their reckoning, broke it frequently: in a word, their washings of hands and pots, their superstitious distinctions of meats, their prayers in public, their villainies in secret, were all reformed, exposed, and condemned by Him; and the cry ran strongly against Him that He came to destroy the Law and the Prophets. And now, sir, what advantage had Christ of your common and necessary foundation? What sufficient number of principles owned by the people did He build on? If He adhered to the old revelation in the true sense, or (which is sufficient to the present argument) in a sense not received by the people, it was in truth the greatest difficulty He had to struggle with: and therefore what could tempt Him, but purely a regard to truth, to take on himself so many difficulties, which might have been avoided, could He have been but silent as to the old revelation, and left the people to their imaginations.

To carry on this plot, we are told, that the next thing which Jesus did was to make choice of proper persons to be His disciples. The gentleman has given us their character; but, as I suppose he has more employment for them before he has done, I desire to defer the consideration of their abilities and conduct till I hear what work he has for them to do. I would only observe that thus far this plot differs from all that ever I heard of. Impostors generally take advantage of the prejudices of the people; generally too they make choice of cunning, dexterous fellows to manage under them; but in this case Jesus opposed all the notions of the people, and made choice of simpletons, it seems, to conduct His contrivances.

But what design, what real end was carrying on all this while? Why, the gentleman tells us, that the very thing disclaimed, the tem-

¹ "Discourse of the Grounds," p. 24.

poral kingdom, was the real thing aimed at under this disguise. He told the people there was no foundation to expect a temporal deliverer, warned them against all who should set up those pretensions; he declared there was no ground from the ancient prophecies to expect such a prince; and yet by these very means He was working His way to an opportunity of declaring Himself to be the very prince the people wanted. We are still on the marvellous; every step opens new wonders. I blame not the gentleman; for what but this can be imagined to give any account of these measures imputed to Christ? Be this never so unlikely, yet this is the only thing that can be said. Had Christ been charged with enthusiasm, it would not have been necessary to assign a reason for His conduct: madness is unaccountable: *Ratione modoque tractari non vult*. But when design, cunning, and fraud are made the charge, and carried to such a height as to suppose Him to be a party to the contrivance of a sham resurrection for Himself, it is necessary to say to what end this cunning tended. It was, we are told, to a kingdom: and indeed the temptation was little enough, considering that the chief conductor of the plot was to be crucified for His pains. But were the means made use of at all probable to attain the end? Yes, says the gentleman, that cannot be disputed; for they had really this effect, the people would have made Him king. Very well: why was He not king then? Why, it happened unluckily that He would not accept the offer, but withdrew Himself from the multitude, and lay concealed till they were dispersed. It will be said, perhaps, that Jesus was a better judge of affairs than the people, and saw it was not yet time to accept the offer. Be it so: let us see then what follows.

The government was alarmed, and Jesus was looked on as a person dangerous to the state; and He had discernment enough to see that His death was determined and inevitable. What does He do then? Why, to make the best of a bad case, and to save the benefit of His undertaking to those who were to succeed Him, He pretends to prophesy of His death, which He knew could not be avoided; and farther, that He should rise again the third day. Men do not use to play tricks *in articulo mortis*; but this plot had nothing common, nothing in the ordinary way. But what if it should appear that after the foretelling of His death (through despair of His fortunes it is said) He had it in His power to set up for king once more, and once more refused the opportunity? Men in despair lay hold on the least help, and never refuse the greatest. Now, the case was really so. After He had foretold His crucifixion, He came to Jerusalem in the triumphant manner the gentleman mentioned; the people strewed His way with boughs and flowers, and were all at His devotion; the Jewish governors lay still for fear of the people. Why was not this opportunity laid hold on to seize the kingdom, or at least to secure Himself from the ignominious death He expected? For whose sake was He contented to die? for whose sake did He contrive this plot of His resurrection? Wife and children He had none; His nearest relations gave little credit to Him;

His disciples were not fit even to be trusted with the secret, nor capable to manage any advantage that could arise from it. However, the gentleman tells us, a kingdom has arisen out of this plot, a kingdom of priests. But when did it arise? Some hundred years after the death of Christ, in opposition to His will, and almost to the subversion of His religion. And yet we are told this kingdom was the thing He had in view. I am apt to think the gentleman is persuaded that the dominion he complains of is contrary to the spirit of the gospel; I am sure some of his friends have taken great pains to prove it so. How then can it be charged as the intention of the gospel to introduce it. Whatever the case was, it cannot surely be suspected that Christ died to make Popes and Cardinals. The alterations which have happened in the doctrines and practices of churches, since the Christian religion was settled by those who had an authentic commission to settle it, are quite out of the question when the inquiry is about the truth of the Christian religion. Christ and His apostles did not vouch for the truth of all that should be taught in the church in future times; nay, they foretold and forewarned the world against such corrupt teachers. It is therefore absurd to challenge the religion of Christ because of the corruptions which have spread amongst Christians. The gospel has no more concern with them, and ought no more to be charged with them than with the doctrines of the Alcoran.

There is but one observation more, I think, which the gentleman made under this head. Jesus, he says, referred to the authority of ancient prophecies to prove that the Messiah was to die and rise again: the ancient books referred to are extant, and no such prophecies, he says, are to be found. Now, whether the gentleman can find these prophecies or no, is not material to the present question. It is allowed that Christ foretold His own death and resurrection; if the resurrection was managed by fraud, Christ was certainly in the fraud Himself, by foretelling the fraud that was to happen: disprove therefore the resurrection, and we shall have no farther occasion for prophecy. On the other side, by foretelling the resurrection, He certainly put the proof of His mission on the truth of the event. Whether it be the character of the Messiah, in the ancient Prophets, or no, that He should die, and rise again; without doubt Jesus is not the Messiah, if He did not rise again: for, by His own prophecy, He made it part of the character of the Messiah. If the event justified the prediction, it is such an evidence as no man of sense and reason can reject. One would naturally think that the foretelling His resurrection, and giving such public notice to expect it that His keenest enemies were fully apprised of it, carried with it the greatest mark of sincere dealing. It stands thus far clear of the suspicion of fraud. And had it proceeded from enthusiasm, and a heated imagination, the dead body at least would have rested in the grave, and without farther evidence have confuted such pretensions: and since the dead body was not only carried openly to the grave, but there watched and guarded, and yet could never afterwards be found,

never heard of more as a dead body, there must of necessity have been either a real miracle, or a great fraud in this case. Enthusiasm dies with the man, and has no operation on his dead body. There is therefore here no medium; you must either admit the miracle, or prove the fraud.

Judge. Mr. A., you are at liberty either to reply to what has been said under this head, or to go on with your cause.

Mr. A. My Lord, the observations I laid before you were but introductory to the main evidences on which the merits of the case must rest. The gentleman concluded that here must be a real miracle or a great fraud; a fraud, he means, to which Jesus in His lifetime was a party. There is, he says, no medium. I beg his pardon. Why might it not be an enthusiasm in the master which occasioned the prediction, and fraud in the servants who put it in execution?

Mr. B. My Lord, this is new matter, and not a reply. The gentleman opened this transaction as a fraud from one end to the other. Now he supposes Christ to have been an honest, poor enthusiast, and the disciples only to be cheats.

Judge. Sir, if you go to new matter the counsel on the other side must be admitted to answer.

Mr. A. My Lord, I have no such intention. I was observing that the account I gave of Jesus was only to introduce the evidence that is to be laid before the court. It cannot be expected that I should know all the secret designs of this contrivance, especially considering that we have but short accounts of this affair, and those too conveyed to us through hands of friends and parties to the plot. In such a case it is enough if we can imagine what the views probably were; and in such case too it must be very easy for a gentleman of parts to raise contrary imaginations, and to argue plausibly from them. But the gentleman has rightly observed that if the resurrection be a fraud, there is an end of all pretensions, good or bad, that were to be supported by it: therefore I shall go on to prove this fraud, which is one main part of the cause now to be determined.

I beg leave to remind you that Jesus in His lifetime foretold His death, and that He should rise again the third day. The first part of His prediction was accomplished: He died on the cross, and was buried. I will not trouble you with the particulars of His crucifixion, death, and burial: it is a well-known story.

Mr. B. My Lord, I desire to know whether the gentleman charges any fraud on this part of the history. Perhaps he may be of opinion, by and by, that there was a sleight of hand in the crucifixion, and that Christ only counterfeited death.

Mr. A. No, no; have no such fears; He was not crucified by His disciples, but by the Romans and the Jews; and they were in very good earnest. I will prove beyond contradiction that the dead body was fairly laid in the tomb, and the tomb sealed up; and it will be well for you if you can get it as fairly out again.

Judge. Go on with your evidence.

Mr. A. My Lord, the crucifixion being over, the dead body was conveyed to a sepulchre; and in the general opinion there seemed to be an end of the whole design. But the governors of the Jews, watchful for the safety of the people, called to mind that Jesus in His lifetime had said that He would rise again on the third day. It may at first sight seem strange that they should give any attention to such a prophecy; a prophecy big with confidence and presumption, and which to the common sense of mankind carried its confutation along with it: and "there is no other nation in the world which would not have slighted such a vain prognostication of a known impostor." But they had warning to be watchful. It was not long before that the people "had like to have been fatally deluded and imposed on by him in the pretended resuscitation of Lazarus." They had fully discovered the cheat in the case of Lazarus, and had narrowly escaped the dangerous consequences of it. And though Jesus was dead, yet He had many disciples and followers alive, who were ready enough to combine in any fraud to verify the prediction of their master. Should they succeed, the rulers foresaw, the consequences in this case would be more fatal than those which before they had narrowly escaped. Upon this account they addressed themselves to the Roman governor, told him how the case was, and desired that he would grant them a guard to watch the sepulchre; that the service would not be long, for the prediction limited the resurrection to the third day; and when that was over, the soldiers might be released from the duty. Pilate granted the request; and a guard was set to watch the sepulchre.

This was not all. The chief priests took another method to prevent all frauds, and it was the best that could possibly be taken; which was to seal up the door of the sepulchre. To understand to what purpose this caution was used, you need only consider what is intended by sealing up doors, and boxes or writings. Is it not for the satisfaction of all parties concerned that they may be sure things are in the state they left them when they come and find their seals not injured? This was the method used by Darius when Daniel was cast into the lions' den; he sealed the door of the den. And for what purpose? Was it not to satisfy himself and his court that no art had been used to preserve Daniel? And when he came and saw Daniel safe, and his own seal untouched, he was satisfied. And indeed if we consider the thing rightly, a seal thus used imports a covenant. If you deliver writings to a person sealed, and he accepts them so, your delivery and his acceptance implies a covenant between you that the writings shall be delivered, and the seal whole; and should the seal be broken, it would be a manifest fraud and breach of trust. Nay, so strongly is this covenant implied that there needs no special agreement in the case; it is a compact which men are put under by the law of nations, and the common consent of mankind. When you send a letter sealed to the post-house, you have not indeed a special agreement with all persons through whose hands it passes that it shall not be opened by any hand

but his only to whom it is directed; yet men know themselves to be under this restraint, and that it is unlawful and dishonorable to transgress it.

Since, then, the sepulchre was sealed; since the seal imported a covenant, consider who were the parties to this covenant. They could be no other than the chief priests on one side and the apostles on the other. To prove this no special agreement need be shown. On one side there was a concern to see the prediction fulfilled; on the other, to prevent fraud in fulfilling it. The sum of the agreement was naturally this, that the seals should be opened at the time appointed for the resurrection, that all parties might see and be satisfied whether the dead body was come to life or no.

What now would any reasonable man expect from these circumstances? Do not you expect to hear that the chief priests and the apostles met at the time appointed, opened the seals and that the matter in dispute was settled beyond all controversy one way or the other? But see how it happened. The seals were broken and the body stolen away in the night by the disciples; none of the chief priests present or summoned to see the seals opened. The guards, when examined, were forced to confess the truth, though joined with an acknowledgment of guilt on their part, which made them liable to be punished by Pilate: they confessed that they were asleep and in the meantime the body was stolen away by the disciples.

The evidence of the Roman soldiers and the far stronger evidence arising from the clandestine manner of breaking up the seals are sufficient proof of fraud.

But there is another circumstance in the case of equal weight. Though the seals did not prevent the cheat entirely, yet they effectually falsified the prediction. According to the prediction Jesus was to rise on the third day or after the third day. At this time the chief priests intended to be present and probably would have been attended by a great multitude. This made it impossible to play any tricks at that time; and therefore the apostles were forced to hasten the plot, and accordingly the resurrection happened a day before its time; for the body was buried on the Friday and was gone early in the morning of Sunday.

These are plain facts; facts from the accounts given us by those who are friends to the belief of the resurrection. The gentleman will not call these imaginations or complain that I have given him schemes instead of evidence.

Mr. B. My Lord, I am now to consider that part of the argument on which the gentleman lays the greatest stress. He has given us his evidence, mere evidence, he says, unmixed and clear of all schemes and imaginations. In one thing indeed he has been as good as his word; he has proved beyond contradiction that Christ died and was laid in the sepulchre; for without doubt when the Jews sealed the stone, they took care to see that the body was there; otherwise their precaution was useless. He has proved too that the prediction of Christ concerning His

own resurrection was a thing publicly known in all Jerusalem; for he owns that this gave occasion for all the care that was taken to prevent fraud. If this open prediction implies a fraudulent design, the evidence is strong with the gentleman: but if it will appear to be what it really was, the greatest mark that could be given of sincerity and plain dealing in the whole affair, the evidence will be still as strong, but the weight of it will fall on the wrong side for the gentleman's purpose.

In the next place, the gentleman seems to be at a great loss to account for the credit which the chief priests gave to the prediction of the resurrection by the care they took to prevent it. He thinks the thing in itself was too extravagant and absurd to deserve any regard; and that no one would have regarded such a prediction in any other time or place. I agree with the gentleman entirely; but then I demand of him a reason why the chief priests were under any concern about the prediction. Was it because they had plainly discovered Him to be a cheat and an impostor? It is impossible. This reason would have convinced them of the folly and presumption of the prediction. It must therefore necessarily be that they had discovered something in the life and actions of Christ which raised this jealousy, and made them listen to a prophecy in this case which in any other case they would have despised. And what could this be but the secret conviction they were under by His many miracles of His extraordinary powers? This care, therefore, of the chief priests over His dead, helpless body is a lasting testimony of the mighty works which Jesus did in His lifetime; for had the Jews been persuaded that He performed no wonders in His life, I think they would not have been afraid of seeing any done by Him after His death.

But the gentleman is of another mind. He says they had discovered a plain cheat in the case of Lazarus, whom Christ had pretended to raise from the dead; and therefore they took all this care to guard a like cheat.

I begin now to want evidences: I am forbid to call this imagination; what else to call it I know not. There is not the least intimation given from history that there was any cheat in the case of Lazarus or that anyone suspected a cheat. Lazarus lived in the country after he was raised from the dead, and though his life was secretly and basely sought after, yet nobody had the courage to call him to a trial for his part of the cheat. It may be said perhaps that the rulers were terrified. Very well; but they were not terrified when they had Christ in their possession, when they brought Him to trial; why did they not then object this cheat to Christ? It would have been much to their purpose. Instead of that, they accuse Him of a design to pull down their temple, to destroy their law, and of blasphemy; but not word of any fraud in the case of Lazarus or any other case.

But not to enter into the merits of this cause, which has in it too many circumstances for your present consideration; let us take the case to be as the gentleman states it, that the cheat in the case of Lazarus was detected; what consequence is to be expected? In all other cases, im-

postors once discovered grow odious and contemptible and quite incapable of doing further mischief; so little are they regarded that even when they tell the truth they are neglected. Was it so in this case? No, says the gentleman; the Jews were the more careful that Christ should not cheat them in His own resurrection. Surely this is a most singular case. When the people thought Him a prophet the chief priests sought to kill him and thought His death would put an end to His pretensions; when they and the people discovered Him to be a cheat, then they thought Him not safe even when He was dead, but were afraid that He would prove a true prophet and, according to His prediction, rise again. A needless, a preposterous fear!

In the next place the gentleman tells us how proper the care was that the chief priests took. I agree perfectly with him. Human policy could not invent a more proper method to guard against and prevent fraud. They delivered the sepulchre with the dead body in it to a company of Roman soldiers, who had orders from their officer to watch the sepulchre. Their care went still further, they sealed the door of the sepulchre.

On this occasion the gentleman has explained the use of seals when applied to such purposes. They imply, he says, a covenant that the things sealed up shall remain in the condition they are till the parties to the sealing agree to open them. I see no reason to enter into the learning about seals; let it be as the gentleman has opened it; what then?

Why, then it seems the apostles and chief priests were in a covenant that there should be no resurrection, at least no opening of the door, till they met together at an appointed time to view and unseal the door.

Your Lordship and the court will now consider the probability of this supposition. When Christ was seized and carried to His trial, His disciples fled and hid themselves for fear of the Jews, out of a just apprehension that they should, if apprehended, be sacrificed with their master. Peter, indeed, followed Him, but his courage soon failed, and it is well known in what manner he denied Him. After the death of Christ, His disciples were so far from being ready to engage for His resurrection or to enter into terms and agreements for the manner in which it should be done that they themselves did not believe it ever would be; they gave over all hopes and thoughts of it; and far from entering into engagements with the chief priests, their whole concern was to keep themselves concealed from them. . . .

The Jews it was plain were exceedingly solicitous about this event. For this reason they obtained a guard from Pilate; and when they had, they were still suspicious lest their guards should deceive them. To secure this point they sealed the door and required of the guards to deliver up the sepulchre to them sealed as it was. This is the natural and true account of the matter. . . . This is in all such cases but a necessary care; you may place guards, and when you do all is in their power: *Et quis custodes custodiat ipsos?*

But it seems that notwithstanding all this care, the seal was broken and the body gone. If you complain of this, sir, demand satisfaction of your guards; they only are responsible for it; the disciples had no more to do in it than you or I.

The guards, the gentleman says, have confessed the truth, and owned that they were asleep and that the disciples in the meantime stole away the body. I wish the guards were in court, I would ask them how they came to be so punctual in relating what happened when they were asleep? what induced them to believe that the body was stolen at all? what, that it was stolen by the disciples, since by their own confession they were asleep and saw nothing, saw nobody? But since they are not to be had, I would desire to ask the gentleman the same questions, and whether he has any authorities in point, to shew that ever any man was admitted as an evidence in court to prove a fact which happened when he was asleep. I see the gentleman is uneasy; I will press the matter no further.

As this story has no evidence to support it, so neither has it any probability. The gentleman has given you the character of the disciples, that they were weak, ignorant men, full of the popular prejudices and superstitions of their country, which stuck close to them notwithstanding their long acquaintance with their master. The apostles are not much wronged in this account; and is it likely that such men should engage in so desperate a design as to steal away the body in opposition to the combined power of the Jews and Romans? What could tempt them to do it? What good would the dead body do them? or if it could have done them any, what hope had they to succeed in their attempt? . . .

But supposing the thing practicable, yet the attempt was such as the disciples consistently with their own notions could not undertake. The gentleman says they continued all their master's lifetime to expect to see Him a temporal prince; and a friend of the gentleman¹ has observed what is equally true that they had the same expectation after His death. Now consider their case. Their master was dead; and they are to contrive to steal away His body. For what? Did they expect to make a king of the dead body, if they could get it into their power? Or did they think if they had it they could raise it to life again? If they trusted so far to their master's prediction as to expect His resurrection (which I think it is evident they did not) could they yet think the resurrection depended on their having the dead body?

* * * * *

But let us leave these suppositions, and see how the true evidence in this case stands. Guards were placed, and they did their duty. But what are guards and sentinels against the power of God! An angel of the Lord opened the sepulchre; the guards saw him and became as dead men. This account they give to the chief priests, who still persisting in

¹ "Grounds," p. 33.

their obstinacy bribed the guards to tell the contradictory story of their being asleep and the body stolen.

I cannot but observe to your Lordship that all these circumstances, so much questioned and suspected, were necessary circumstances supposing the resurrection to be true. The seal was broken, the body came out of the sepulchre, the guards were placed in vain to prevent it. Be it so: I desire to know whether the gentleman thinks that the seal put God under covenant? or could prescribe to him a method of performing this great work? or whether he thinks the guards were placed to maintain the seal in opposition to the power of God. If he will maintain neither of these points, then the opening of the seals, notwithstanding the guard set on them, will be an evidence, not of the fraud, but of the power of the resurrection; and the guards will have nothing to answer for but only this that they were not stronger than God. The seal was a proper check on the guards; the Jews had no other meaning in it; they could not be so stupid as to imagine that they could by this contrivance disappoint the designs of Providence. And it is surprising to hear these circumstances made use of to prove the resurrection to be a fraud which yet could not but happen, supposing the resurrection to be true.

[Mr. B. the attorney for the resurrection then shows that the three days foretold between the crucifixion and resurrection were exactly accomplished according to legal and common usage. Mr. A., attorney for infidelity, then resumes:]

Mr. A. My Lord, before I proceed any farther, I beg leave to say a few words in reply to what the gentleman has offered on this head.

The gentleman thinks that the detection in the case of Lazarus ought to have made the Jews quite unconcerned in the case of Jesus, and secure as to the event of His own resurrection. He says very true supposing their care had been for themselves but governors have another care on their hands, the care of their people; and it is not enough for them to guard against being imposed on themselves, they must be watchful to guard the multitude against frauds and deceits. The chief priests were satisfied indeed of the fraud in the case of Lazarus, yet they saw the people deceived by it; and for this reason, and not for their own satisfaction, they used the caution in the case of the resurrection of Jesus, which I before laid before you. In so doing, they are well justified and the inconsistency charged on the other side between their opinion of Jesus and their fear of being imposed on by His pretended resurrection is fully answered.

The next observation relates to the seal of the sepulchre. The gentleman thinks the seal was used as a check on the Roman soldiers. But what reason had the Jews to suspect them? They were not disciples of Jesus; they were servants of the Roman governor, and employed in the

service of the Jews: and I leave it to the court to judge whether the Jews set the seal to guard against their friends or their enemies. But if the seals were really used against the guards, then the breaking of the seals is a proof that the guards were corrupted, and if so, it is easy to conceive how the body was removed.

As to the disciples, the gentleman observes that the part allotted to them in the management of the resurrection supposes an unaccountable change in their character. It will not be long before the gentleman will have occasion for as great a change in their character; for these weak men, you will find soon employed in converting the world and sent to appear before kings and princes in the name of their master; soon you will see them grow wise and powerful and every way qualified for their extensive and important business. The only difference between me and the gentleman on the other side will be found to be this, that I date this change a little earlier than he does: a small matter surely to determine the right of this controversy. . . .

My Lord, we are now to enter on the last and main article of this case—the nature of the evidence on which the credit of the resurrection stands. Before I inquire into the qualifications of the particular witnesses whom we are desired to take in this case, I would ask why this evidence, which manifestly relates to the most essential point of Christianity, was not put beyond all exception? Many of the miracles of Christ are said to be done in the streets, nay even in the temple, under the observation of all the world; but the like is not so much as pretended as to this; nay, we have it on the confession of Peter, the ring-leader of the apostles, that Christ appeared, "not to all the people but to witnesses chosen before of God" (Acts 10: 41). Why picking and culling of witnesses in this case more than in any other: Does it not import some suspicion, raise some jealousy, that this case would not bear the public light?

I would ask more particularly, Why did not Jesus after His resurrection appear openly to the chief priests and rulers of the Jews? Since His commission related to them in an especial manner, why were not His credentials laid before them? The resurrection is acknowledged to be the chief proof of His mission; why then was it concealed from those who were more than all others concerned in the event of His mission? Suppose an ambassador from some foreign prince should come into England, make His public entry through the city, pay and receive visits, and at the last refuse to show any letters of credence, or to wait on the king, what would you think of Him? Whatever you would think in that case you must think in this; for there is no difference between them.

But we must take the evidence as it is. It was thought proper, in this case, to have select chosen witnesses; and we must now consider who they were, and what reason we have to take their word.

The first witness was an angel, or angels. They appeared like men to some women who went early to the sepulchre. If they appeared like

men, on what ground are we to take them for angels? The women saw men and therefore they can witness only to the seeing of men. But I suppose it is the women's judgment, and not their evidence that we are to follow in this case. Here then we have a story of one apparition to support the credit of another apparition; and the first apparition hath not so much as the evidence of the women to support it, but is grounded on their superstition, ignorance and fear. Every country can afford a hundred instances of this kind; and there is this common to them all, that as learning and common sense prevail in any country, they die away and are no more heard of.

The next witnesses are the women themselves. The wisest men can hardly guard themselves against the fears of superstition; poor silly women, therefore, in this case must needs be unexceptionable witnesses, and first to be admitted into the number of the chosen witnesses to attest this fact! One part of the account given of them is very rational, that they were surprised and frightened beyond measure; and I leave it to your Lordship and the court to judge how well qualified they were to give a just relation of what passed.

After this Jesus appears to two of His disciples as they were on a journey; He joins them and introduces a discourse about Himself and spent much time till it began to grow dark, in expounding the prophecies relating to the death and resurrection of the Messias. All this while the disciples knew Him not. But then going into a house to lodge together, at supper He broke bread and gave it to them; immediately they knew Him; immediately He vanished. Here then are two witnesses more. But what will you call them? Eyewitnesses? Why, their eyes were open and they had their senses when He reasoned with them, and they knew Him not. So far, therefore, they are witnesses that it was not He. Tell us therefore upon what account you reject the evidences of their sense before the breaking of the bread and insist on it afterwards? And why did Jesus vanish as soon as known; which has more the air of an apparition than of the appearance of a real man restored to life.

Cleopas, who was one of these two disciples, finds out the apostles to make the report of what had passed to them. No sooner was the story told but Jesus appears among them. They were all frightened and confounded and thought they saw a spectre. He rebukes them for infidelity, and their slowness in believing the prophecies of His resurrection; and though He refused before to let the women touch Him (a circumstance which I ought not to have omitted) yet now He invites the apostles to handle Him, to examine His hands and feet and search the wounds of the cross. But what body was it they examined? The same that came in when the doors were shut; the same that vanished from the two disciples; the same that the women might not touch: in a word a body quite different from a human body, which we know cannot pass through walls or appear or disappear at pleasure. What then could their hands or eyes inform them of in this case? Besides is it

credible that God should raise a body imperfectly, with the very wounds in it of which it died? Or, if the wounds were such as destroyed the body before, how could a natural body subsist with them afterwards?

There are more appearances of Jesus recorded; but so much of the same kind, so liable to the same difficulties and objections that I will not trouble your Lordship and the court with a distinct enumeration of them. If the gentleman on the other side finds any advantage in any of them more than in these mentioned, I shall have an opportunity to consider them in my reply.

It may seem surprising to you, perhaps, that a matter of this moment was trusted upon such evidence as this; but it will be still more surprising to consider that the several nations who received the gospel, and submitted to the faith of this article, had not even this evidence: for what people or nation had the evidence of the angels, the women or even of the apostles? So far from it that every country had its single apostle and received the faith on the credit of his single evidence. We have followed our ancestors without inquiry; and if you examine the thing to the bottom, our belief was originally built on the word of one man.

I shall trouble you, sir, but with one observation more, which is this: that although in common life we act in a thousand instances on the faith and credit of human testimony, yet the reason for doing so is not the same in the case before us. In common affairs, where nothing is asserted but what is probable and according to the usual course of nature, a reasonable degree of evidence ought to determine every man: for the very probability or possibility of the thing is a support to the evidence; and in such cases we have no doubt but a man's senses qualify him to be a witness. But when the thing testified to is contrary to the order of nature, and at first sight at least, impossible, what evidence can be sufficient to overturn the constant evidence of nature, which she gives us in the uniform and regular method of her operations? If a man tells me he has been in France, I ought to give a reason for not believing him; but if he tells me he comes from the grave, what reason can he give me why I should believe him? In the case before us, since the body raised from the grave differed from common natural bodies, as we have before seen, how can I be assured that the apostles' senses qualified them to judge at all of His body—whether it was the same or not the same, which was buried? They handled the body, which yet could pass through doors and walls; they saw it and sometimes knew it, at other times they knew it not. In a word, it seems to be a case exempt from human evidence. Men have limited senses and a limited reason: when they act within their limits, we may give credit to them; but when they talk of things removed beyond the reach of their senses and reason, we must quit our own if we believe theirs.

Mr. B. My Lord, in answer to the objections under this head I shall find myself obliged to change the order in which the gentleman thought

proper to place them. He began with complaining that Christ did not appear publicly to the Jews after His resurrection, and especially to the chief priests and rulers; and seemed to argue as if such evidence would have put the matter in question out of all doubt; but he concluded with an observation to prove that no evidence in this case can be sufficient; that a resurrection is a thing in nature impossible, at least impossible to be proved to the satisfaction of a rational inquirer. If this be the case why does he require more evidence since none can be sufficient? Or to what purpose is it to vindicate the particular evidence of the resurrection of Christ so long as this general prejudice that a resurrection is incapable of being proved remains unremoved? I am under a necessity therefore to consider this observation in the first place, that it may not lie as a dead weight on all I have to offer in support of the evidence of Christ's resurrection.

The gentleman allows it to be reasonable in many cases to act on the testimony and credit of others; but he thinks this should be confined to such cases where the thing testified to is probable, possible and according to the usual course of nature. The gentleman does not, I suppose, pretend to know the extent of all natural possibilities, much less will he suppose them to be generally known, and therefore his meaning must be that the testimony of witnesses is to be received only in cases which appear to us to be possible. In any other sense we can have no dispute; for mere impossibilities, which can never exist, can never be proved. Taking the observation, therefore, in this sense, the proposition is this: that the testimony of others ought not to be admitted but in such matters as appear probable or at least possible, to our conceptions. For instance: a man who lives in a warm climate and never saw ice ought on no evidence to believe that rivers freeze and grow hard in cold countries; for this is improbable, contrary to the usual course of nature and impossible according to his notion of things. And yet we all know that this is a plain, manifest case, discernible by the senses of men, of which therefore they are qualified to be good witnesses. A hundred instances might be named, but it is needless; for surely nothing is more apparently absurd than to make one man's ability in discerning and his veracity in reporting plain facts depend on the skill or ignorance of the hearer. And what has the gentleman said on this occasion against the resurrection more than any man who never saw ice might say against an hundred honest witnesses who assert that water turns to ice in cold countries.

It is very true that men do not so easily believe, on testimony of others, things which to them seem improbable or impossible; but the reason is not because the thing itself admits of no evidence but because the hearer's preconceived opinion outweighs the credit of the reporter and makes his veracity to be called in question. For instance: it is natural for a stone to roll down hill; it is unnatural for it to roll up hill; but a stone moving up hill is as much an object of sense as a stone moving down hill; and all men in their senses are capable of seeing and

judging, and reporting the fact in one case as in the other. Should a man tell you he saw a stone go up hill of its own accord, you might question his veracity; but you could not say the thing admitted of no evidence because it was contrary to the law and usual course of nature . . . whenever you see facts yourself which contradict your notion of law of nature, you admit the facts because you believe yourself; when you do not admit the like facts on the evidence of others it is because you do not believe them, and not because the facts in their own nature exclude all evidence.

Suppose a man should tell you that he was come from the dead, you would be apt to suspect his evidence. But what would you suspect? That he was not alive when you heard him, saw him, felt him and conversed with him? You could not suspect this, without giving up all your senses and acting in this case as you act in no other. Here then you would question whether the man had ever been dead. But would you say that it is incapable of being made plain by human testimony that this or that man died a year ago? It cannot be said. Evidence in this case is admitted in all courts perpetually.

Consider it the other way. Suppose you saw a man publicly executed, his body afterwards wounded by the executioner, and carried and laid in the grave; that after this you should be told that the man was come to life again; what would you suspect in this case? Not that the man had never been dead, for that you saw yourself; but you would suspect whether he was now alive. But would you say this case excluded all human testimony, and that men could not possibly discern whether one with whom they conversed familiarly was alive or no? On what ground could you say this? A man rising from the grave is an object of sense, and can give the same evidence of his being alive as any other man in the world can give. So that a resurrection considered only as a fact to be proved by evidence is a plain case; it requires no greater ability in the witnesses than that they be able to distinguish between a man dead and a man alive: a point in which I believe every man living thinks himself a judge.

I do allow that this case and others of like nature require more evidence to give them credit than ordinary cases do. You may therefore require more evidence in these than in other cases; but it is absurd to say that such cases admit of no evidence, when the things in question are manifestly objects of sense.

I allow farther that the gentleman has rightly stated the difficulty on the foot of common prejudice; and that it arises from hence that such cases appear to be contrary to the course of nature. But I desire him to consider what the course of nature is. Every man from the lowest countryman to the highest philosopher frames to himself from his experience and observation a notion of a course of nature; and is ready to say of everything reported to him that contradicts his experience that it is contrary to nature. But will the gentleman say that everything is impossible or even improbable that contradicts the notion which men

frame to themselves of the course of nature? I think he will not say it. And if he will, he must say that water can never freeze; for it is absolutely inconsistent with the notion which men have of the course of nature, who live in the warm climates. And hence it appears that when men talk of the course of nature they really talk of their own prejudices and imaginations; and that sense and reason are not so much concerned in the case as the gentleman imagines. . . . Our senses then inform us rightly what the usual course of things is, but when we conclude that things cannot be otherwise we outrun the information of our senses and the conclusion stands on prejudice and not on reason. And yet such conclusions form what is generally called the course of nature. And when men on proper evidence and information admit things contrary to this presupposed course of nature, they do not, as the gentleman expresses it, "quit their own sense and reason," but in truth they quit their own mistakes and prejudices.

In the case before us, the case of the resurrection, the great difficulty arises from the like prejudice. We all know by experience that all men die and rise no more; therefore we conclude that for a dead man to rise to life again is contrary to the course of nature. And certainly it is contrary to the uniform and settled course of nature. But if we argue from hence that it is contrary and repugnant to the real laws of nature and absolutely impossible on that account we argue without any foundation to support us, either from our senses or our reason. We cannot learn from our eyes or feeling or any other sense that it is impossible for a dead body to return to life again: if we learn it at all it must be from our reason; and yet what one maxim of reason is contradicted by the supposition of a resurrection? For my own part, when I consider how I live, that all the animal motions necessary to my life are independent of my will; that my heart beats without my consent . . . I cannot but think that the preservation of my life in every moment of it is as great an act of power as is necessary to raise a dead man to life. And whoever so far reflects on his own being as to acknowledge that he owes it to a superior power, must needs think that the same power which gave life to senseless matter at first and set all the springs and movements a-going at the beginning; can restore life to a dead body. For surely it is not a greater thing to give life to a body once dead than to a body that never was alive.

In the next place must be considered the difficulties which the gentleman has laid before you with regard to the nature of Christ's body after the resurrection. He has produced some passages which, he thinks, imply that the body was not a real, natural body, but a mere phantom or apparition: and thence concludes that there being no real object of sense there can be no evidence in the case.

Presumptions are of no weight against positive evidence, and every account of the resurrection assures us that the body of Christ was seen, felt and handled by many persons, who were called on by Christ so to do, that they might be assured that He had flesh and bones and was

not a mere spectre, as they, in their first surprise, imagined Him to be.

It is impossible that they who give this account should mean by anything they report to imply that He had no real body; it is certain then that when the gentleman makes use of what they say to this purpose he uses their sayings contrary to their meaning; for it is not pretended that they say that Christ had not a real human body after the resurrection; nor is it pretended that they had any such thought, except only on the first surprise of seeing Him before they had examined Him with their eyes and hands. But something they have said which the gentleman, according to his notions of philosophy, thinks implies that the body was not real. To clear this point, therefore, I must lay before you the passages referred to and consider how justly the gentleman reasons from them.

[The lawyer for the resurrection then considers Christ's word to Mary, "Touch me not for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren and tell them," etc., contending that the words "don't touch me" do not at all imply that Christ's body was not such as could be touched, but only that Mary should not cling to His feet and detain Him but should hasten away to tell the apostles of His resurrection. I have also seen the very interesting and probable explanation that just as the Jewish High Priest was not to be touched and defiled between the time he offered the sacrifice and entered into the holy place, so our Lord, our Great High Priest, was not to be touched after the pouring out of His blood in sacrifice until He had first presented it to His Father in heaven. Mr. B. then shows how natural it was that the two on the way to Emmaus, walking in the twilight side by side with the stranger who joined Himself to them, should not have had a good look at His face and, in their knowledge that Jesus had been killed, could not believe or conceive that He was there with them until the direct look in the light of the lamp at the breaking of bread, done with nail scarred hands, revealed Him to them. As to His disappearing after appearing to them in the closed room, which He may have entered supernaturally or by the door whose opening the disciples did not notice, Mr. B. observes:]

Is there no way for a real body to disappear? Try the experiment now, do but put out the candles we shall all disappear. If a man falls asleep in the daytime all things disappear to him; his senses are all

locked up; and yet all things about him continue to be real and his senses continue perfect. As shutting out all rays of light would make all things disappear; so intercepting the rays of light from any particular body would make that disappear. Perhaps something like this was the case, or perhaps something else of which we know nothing. But be the case what it will, the gentleman's conclusion is founded on no principle of true philosophy, for it does not follow that a body is not real because I lose sight of it suddenly. I shall be told, perhaps, that this way of accounting for the passage is as wonderful and as much out of the common course of things as the other. Perhaps it is so; and what then? Surely the gentleman does not expect that in order to prove the reality of the greatest miracle that ever was I should shew that there was nothing miraculous in it, but that everything happened according to the ordinary course of things. My only concern is to show that these passages do not infer that the body of Christ after the resurrection was no real body.

* * * * *

I come now to consider the evidence on which our belief of the resurrection stands. And here I am stopped again. A general exception is taken to the evidence that it is imperfect, unfair; and a question is asked "Why did not Christ appear publicly to all the people, especially to the magistrates? Why were some witnesses culled and chosen out and others excluded?"

It may be sufficient perhaps to say that where there are witnesses enough no judge, no jury complains for want of more, and therefore if the witnesses we have are sufficient it is no objection that we have not others and more. If three credible men attest a will, which are as many as the law requires, would anybody ask why all the town were not called to set their hands? But why were these witnesses culled and chosen out? Why? For this reason that they might be good ones. Does not every wise man choose proper witnesses to his deed and to his will? and does not a good choice of witnesses give strength to every deed? How comes it to pass, then, that the very thing which shuts out all suspicion in other cases should in this case only, be of all others the most suspicious thing itself?

What reason there is to make any complaints on behalf of the Jews may be judged in part from what has already appeared. Christ suffered openly in their sight and they were so well apprised of His prediction that He should rise again that they set a guard on His sepulchre, and from their guards they learned the truth. Every soldier was to them a witness of the resurrection of their own choosing. After this they had not one apostle (which the gentleman observes was the case of other peoples) but all the apostles and many other witnesses with them and in their power. The apostles testified the resurrection to them, not only to the people but to the elders of Israel assembled in the senate; to support their evidence they were enabled to work and did

work miracles openly in the name of Christ. These people therefore have the least reason to complain, and had of all others the fullest evidence, and in some respects such as none but themselves could have, for they only were keepers of the sepulchre. I believe if the gentleman was to choose an evidence to his own satisfaction in a like case he would desire no more than to keep the sepulchre with a sufficient number of guards.

[Mr. B. then deals with the contention that Christ's action in not appearing to all the people is a suspicious circumstance and calls attention to the fact that when His many miracles had fully attested His Messiahship and He had been rejected He had given the solemn warning: "Ye shall see me no more till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord" and that "the Jews were not in this disposition after the resurrection nor are they yet in it." Furthermore, he observes, "The resurrection was the foundation of Christ's new mission, which extended to all the world. Then it was He declared 'all power was given unto him in heaven and in earth.'"]

Then He gave a new commission to His disciples, not restrained to the house of Israel, but to go and "teach all nations." This prerogative the Jews had under this commission, that the gospel was everywhere first offered to them; but in no other terms than it was offered to the rest of the world. Since then this commission of which the resurrection was the foundation extended to all the world alike, what ground is there to demand special and particular evidence to the Jews? The emperor and the senate of Rome were a much more considerable part of the world than the chief priests and the synagogue; why does not the gentleman object then that Christ did not show Himself to Tiberius and the senate? And since all men have an equal right in this case why may not the same demand be made for every country and every age?

* * * * *

As the resurrection was the opening of a new commission in which all the world had an interest, so the concern naturally was to have a proper evidence to establish this truth and which should be of equal weight to all. This did not depend on the satisfaction given to private persons, whether they were magistrates or not magistrates; but on the conviction of those whose office it was to be to bear testimony to this truth in the world. In this sense the apostles were chosen to be witnesses of the resurrection because they were chosen to bear testimony to the world; and not because they only were admitted to see Christ after His resurrection: for the case is otherwise.

The Gospel, indeed, concerned to show the evidence on which the faith of the world was to rest, is very particular in setting forth the ocular demonstration which the apostles had of the resurrection; and mentions others who saw Christ after His resurrection only accidentally and as the thread of the history led them to it. But yet it is certain that there were many others who had this satisfaction as well as the apostles. . . .

As to the witnesses themselves, the first the gentleman takes notice of are the angels and the women. The mention of angels led naturally to apparitions; and the women were called poor silly women, and there is an end of their evidence. . . . But will the gentleman pretend to prove that there are no intelligent beings between God and man. . . . Till some of these points are disproved we may be at rest; for the angels were ministers, not witnesses of the resurrection. . . .

But for the women themselves what shall we say? Silly as they were, I hope at least they had eyes and ears and could tell what they heard and saw. In this case they tell no more. They report that the body was not in the sepulchre, but so far from reporting the resurrection they did not believe it and were very anxious to find to what place the body was removed. Further they were not employed. . . . But suppose them to be witnesses, suppose them to be improper ones; yet the evidence of the men surely is not the worse because some women happened to see the same thing which they saw. . . .

I will not spend your time in enumerating these witnesses or in setting forth the demonstration they had of the truth which they report. These things are well known. If you question their sincerity, they lived miserably and died miserably for the sake of this truth. And what greater evidence of sincerity can man give or require? And what is still more, they were not deceived in their expectation by being ill treated; for he who employed them told them beforehand that the world would hate them and treat them with contempt and cruelty.

[Mr. B. then points out that in preaching the Gospel of Christ's resurrection the apostles had the supernatural aid of the Holy Spirit in enabling them to work miracles to confirm the truth of their testimony already proven by the sufferings undergone to establish their sincerity. The trial continues:]

Judge. Have you done, sir?

Mr. B. Yes, my Lord.

Judge. Go on, Mr. A., if you have anything to say in reply.

Mr. A. My Lord, I shall trouble you with very little. The objections and answers under this head I shall leave to the judgment of the court, and beg leave only to make an observation or two on the last part of the gentleman's argument.

And first with respect to the sufferings of the apostles and disciples

of Jesus and the argument drawn from them thence for the truth of their doctrine and assertions, I beg leave to observe to you that there is not a false religion or pretence in the world, but can produce the same authority, and show many instances of men who have suffered even to death for the truth of their several professions. If we consult only modern story we shall see Papists suffering for Popery, Protestants for their religion. And among Protestants every sect has had its martyrs: Puritans, Quakers, Fifth-Monarchy men. In Henry VIII's time England saw both Popish and Protestant martyrs; in Queen Mary's reign the rage fell on Protestants; in Queen Elisabeth's Papists and Puritans were called sometimes, though rarely to this trial. In later times sometimes Church men, sometimes Dissenters were persecuted. What must we say then? All these sufferers had not truth with them; and yet if there be any weight in this argument from suffering they all have a right to plead it.

But I may be told, perhaps, that men by their sufferings, though they do not prove their doctrines to be true, yet prove at least their own sincerity, as if it were a thing impossible for men to dissemble at the point of death! Alas! how many instances there are of men denying facts plainly proved, asserting facts plainly disproved with the rope around their necks? Must all such pass for innocent sufferers, sincere men? If not, it must be allowed that a man's word at the point of death is not always to be relied on. . . .

Another observation I would make is with respect to the evidence of the Spirit, on which so much stress is laid.

It has been hitherto insisted on that the resurrection was a matter of fact and such a fact as was capable and proper to be supported by the evidence of sense. How comes it about that this evidence, which is the proper evidence is given up as insufficient and a new improper evidence introduced? Is it not surprising that one great miracle should want a hundred more to prove it? Every miracle is itself an appeal to sense, and therefore admits no evidence but that of sense. And there is no connection between a miracle done this year and last year. It does not follow, therefore, because Peter cured a lame man (allowing the fact) that therefore Christ rose from the dead.

But allowing the gentleman all he demands, what is it to us? They who had the witness within them did perhaps very well to consult him and to take his word; but how am I or others, who have not this witness in us, the better for it? If the first ages of the Church saw all the wonders related by the gentleman and believed, it shows at least in his opinion that this strong evidence was necessary to create the belief he requires; why then does he require this belief of us who have not this strong evidence?

Judge. Very well, gentlemen of the jury, you have heard the proofs and arguments on both sides, and now it is your part to give a verdict.

Here the gentlemen whispered together and the foreman stood up.

Foreman. My Lord, the case has been long and consists of several articles; therefore the jury hope you will give them your directions.

(To which request the presiding judge after some demur consented.)

Gentlemen of the jury, the question before you is Whether the witnesses of the resurrection of Christ are guilty of giving false evidence or no.

Two sorts of objections or accusations are brought against them. One charges fraud and deceit on the transaction itself; the other charges the evidence as forged and insufficient to support the credit of so extraordinary an event.

There are also three periods of time to be considered.

The first takes in the ministry of Christ and ends at His death. During this period the fraud is supposed to be contrived.

The second reaches from His death to His resurrection. During this period the fraud is supposed to be executed.

The third begins from the resurrection and takes in the whole ministry of the apostles. And here the evidence they gave the world for this fact is the main consideration.

As to the first period of time and the fraud charged on Jesus, I must observe to you that this charge had no evidence to support it; all the facts reported of Jesus stand in full contradiction to it.

[The judge then points out that Christ's conduct in going counter to all the expectation of the Jews, in refusing temporal power when offered to Him, in frankly foretelling or warning of His resurrection on the third day, in holding out to His followers only the reward of persecution for loyalty to Him utterly negatives the contention of fraud on His part. He then gives the substance of the arguments pro and con growing out of the priests' care to have a guard set over Christ's tomb in the light of the fact, as the attorney for infidelity contends, that the resurrection of Lazarus had been disclosed as a "cheat," such a precaution appearing to be irrational on any theory. The fact that the resurrection took place on the third day according to reckoning from Christ's day to this is made clear and among many other things the judge comments on Gamaliel's advice to the council to act cautiously in dealing with the apostles after Christ's resurrection had been proclaimed by them:]

Secondly, It is remarkable that the miracles wrought by the apostles after the death of Christ, those especially which occasioned the calling of this council, had a much greater effect on the Jews than even the miracles of Christ Himself. They held out against all the wonders of Christ and were perpetually plotting His death, not doubting but that

would put an end to their trouble; but when after His death they saw the same powers continue with the apostles, they saw no end of the affair, but began to think in earnest that there might be more in it than they were willing to believe. And on the report made to them of the apostles' works they made serious reflection "and doubted thereunto this would grow." And though in their anger and vexation of heart they thought of desperate remedies and were for killing the apostles also; yet they hearkened willingly to Gamaliel's advice, which at another time might have been dangerous to the adviser. So that it appears from the history that the whole council had the same doubt that Gamaliel had, that possibly the hand of God might be in this thing. And could the Jews, if they had manifestly discovered the cheat of the resurrection a little time before have entertained such a suspicion?

The last period commences at the resurrection and takes in the evidence on which the credit of this fact stands.

The counsel for Woolston among other difficulties stated one which, if well grounded, excludes all evidence out of this case. The resurrection being a thing out of the course of nature, he thinks the testimony of nature held forth to us in her constant method of working a stronger evidence against the possibility of a resurrection than any human evidence can be for the reality of one.

In answer to this it is said on the other side:

First, that a resurrection is a thing to be judged of by men's senses; and this cannot be doubted. We all know when a man is dead; and should he come to life again we might judge whether he was alive or no by the very same means by which we judge those about us to be living men.

Secondly, That the notion of a resurrection contradicts no one principle of right reason, interferes with no law of nature; and that whoever admits that God gave man life at the first cannot possibly doubt of His power to restore it when lost.

[He then points out that the "course of nature" is a variable and invalid standard depending on each man's experience and that the different reports of Christ's appearance are in no wise inconsistent with belief in the tangible reality of His body. The objection that Christ did not appear to all the Jews is disposed of with the remark that]

First that the particular commission to the Jews expired at the death of Christ; and therefore the Jews had, on this account, no claim for any particular evidence. And it is insisted that Christ before His death declared the Jews should not see Him till they were better disposed to receive Him.

Secondly that as the whole world had a concern in the resurrection of Christ, it was necessary to prepare a proper evidence for the whole

world; which was not to be done by any particular satisfaction given to the people of the Jews or their rulers.

Thirdly, That as to the chosen witnesses, it is a mistake to think that they were chosen as the only persons to see Christ after His resurrection, and that in truth many others did see Him; but that the witnesses were chosen as proper persons to bear testimony to all people, an office to which many others who did see Christ were not particularly commissioned. That making choice of proper and credible witnesses was so far from being a ground of just suspicion, that it is in all cases the most proper way to exclude suspicion. . . .

The counsel for the apostles insisted farther that they gave the greatest assurance to the world that possibly could be given of their sincere dealing by suffering all kinds of hardship, and at last death itself in confirmation of the truth of their evidence.

The counsel for Woolston in reply to this told you that all religions, whether true or false, have had their martyrs; that no opinion, however absurd, can be named but some have been content to die for it; and then concluded that suffering is no evidence of the truth of the opinions for which men suffer.

To clear this matter to you I must observe how this case stands. You have heard often in the course of this argument that the apostles were witnesses chosen to bear testimony to the resurrection, and for that reason had the fullest evidence themselves of the truth of it, not merely by seeing Christ once or twice after His death, but by frequent conversations with Him for forty days together before His ascension. . . .

Consider now how the objection stands. The counsel for Woolston tells you that it is common for men to die for false opinions, and he tells you nothing but the truth. But even in these cases their suffering is an evidence of their sincerity; and it would be very hard to charge men who die for the doctrine they profess with insincerity in the profession. Mistaken they may be; but every mistaken man is not a cheat. Now, if you will allow the suffering of the apostles to prove their sincerity, which you cannot well disallow, and consider that they died for the truth of a matter of fact which they had seen themselves you will perceive how strong the evidence in this case is. In doctrines and matters of opinion men mistake perpetually; and it is no reason for me to take up with another's man's opinion because I am persuaded he is sincere in it. But when a man reports to me an uncommon fact, yet such an one as in its own nature is a plain object of sense; if I believe him not, it is not because I suspect his eyes or his sense of feeling, but merely because I suspect his sincerity; for if I were to see the same thing myself I would believe myself; and therefore my suspicion does not arise from the inability of human senses to judge the case, but from a doubt of the sincerity of the reporter. In such cases, therefore, there wants nothing to be proved but only the sincerity of the reporter, and since voluntary suffering for the truth is at least a proof of sincerity,

the suffering of the apostles for the truth of the resurrection is a full and unexceptionable proof.

The counsel for Woolston was sensible of this difference, and therefore he added that there are many instances of men's suffering and dying in obstinate denial of the truth of facts plainly proved. This observation is also true. I remember a story of a man who endured with great constancy all the tortures of the rack, denying the fact with which he was charged. When he was asked afterwards how he could hold out against all the tortures, he answered, "I had painted a gallows on the toe of my shoe, and when the rack stretched me I looked on the gallows and bore the pain to save my life." This man denied a plain fact under great torture, but you see a reason for it. In other cases, when criminals persist in denying their crimes they often do it, and there is reason to suspect they always do it, in hope of a pardon or reprieve. All these men suffer against their will and for their crimes, and their obstinacy is built on the hope of escaping by moving the compassion of the government. Can the gentleman give any instances of persons who died willingly in attestation of a false fact? We have had in England some weak enough to die for the Pope's supremacy; but do you think a man could be found to die in proof of the Pope's being actually on the throne of England?

Now the apostles died in asserting the truth of Christ's resurrection. It was always in their power to quit their evidence and save their lives. Even their bitterest enemies, the Jews, required no more of them than to be silent, Acts 4: 17-29. Others have denied or asserted facts in hopes of saving their lives, when they were under sentence of death; but these men attested a fact at the expense of their lives, which they might have saved by denying the truth. So that between criminals dying and denying plain facts, and the apostles dying for their testimony, there is this material difference—*criminals* deny the truth in hopes of saving their lives; the apostles parted with their lives rather than deny the truth."

The jury returned a verdict in favor of the testimony establishing the fact of Christ's resurrection.

APPENDIX "I"

GOOD NEWS FROM PALESTINE!

A Thrilling Presentation of the Facts of Our Lord's Life

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Our word Gospel comes, of course, from the Anglo-Saxon godspel, or "good news." How good it is, Christians who have acted upon it know. How incontrovertibly true is the news that at one time came out of Palestine even a brief study of its credentials will demonstrate. No news is good unless it be true, and much news these days is bad. But the news that came out of Palestine a couple of thousand years ago is of such nature as to take all the despair out of the tidings from that land now. It is a desire to emphasize the "news" aspect of the facts on which our Christian faith and hope and confidence rest that suggested the writing of the following news dispatches as we can imagine them if they had been printed long ago in the *Rome Evening Recorder*.

SUPERHUMAN BEING APPEARS IN THE PROVINCE OF GALILEE

A news dispatch sent by Maxentius Publius, the dean of the *Record's* staff of able newsgatherers, by the last post from Jerusalem, confirms in every detail the strange rumors which from time to time for the last two or three years have been emanating from that section of our Empire. To a skeptical age like ours the things reported seem utterly incredible, and this paper merely prints what has been reported to it, without expressing its own opinion as to their truth or falsity.

Conference with the highest religious officials, including the secretary of the Pontifex Maximus himself, his gracious majesty the Emperor Tiberius, elicited the cautious opinion that the news may conceivably be true, but is to be received with skepticism, even though reported by Publius himself, the presumption against miraculous events in these modern days, when the gods seem to have withdrawn themselves from active participation in human affairs, being almost conclusive against any supporting testimony whatever.

It was pointed out to this writer that while still believed by the ignorant and unlettered amongst us, the accounts handed down to us from a former age of the appearance upon this earth of heavenly visitors from Olympus, or wherever the home of the gods may be, are now by nearly all people of discernment regarded merely as "the formula by which men of an earlier and less scientific age expressed their belief in things entirely true in spiritual substance though wholly untrue in factual content."¹

¹ a la Auburn Affirmation.

As the Right Reverend Sacerdotus Vagabundus, head of the college of priests of the Pantheon, remarked, "The accounts of the great Jove and the other immortal Gods appearing bodily to the sons of men and even interbreeding with the fair daughters of Hellas and Rome must probably be regarded by an intelligently skeptical man as instances of "wishful thinking," growing out of the deep-rooted human longing for contact with the supernatural world on the part of the men, and if the ladies will pardon a sally at their expense, possibly the most plausible *raison d'être* some of them could offer for certain morphological variations needing an explanation."²

It is to be noted that the accounts of Hercules, Mercury, Apollo, Venus consorting with men and women always many centuries later than the events themselves, are related at second hand or hearsay and placed at a time and place impossible of visit and verification, these being some of the many reasons which have caused the cultured among us to conclude that all such accounts of supernatural events and religions based on them are to be regarded as "equally true by the ignorant, equally false by the learned and equally useful by the magistrates."³

A feature of the present accounts which come to us from the Province of Galilee, however, which it is hard indeed to account for on any rational ground, is that our correspondent, by his own sign and signet, which in all the years he has been connected with this paper has never been known to certify to a false or unfounded allegation, avers that he has been personally present when the man about whom these wonders are reported stood before a crowd of about five thousand people with a few small fish and loaves of bread and merely by continually breaking them supplied a superabundance of food with which to feed the whole mass of people there assembled, with a considerable number of baskets of fragments left over; that on another occasion a blind beggar named Bartimeus, who for more than a score of years had subsisted by begging at the east gate of Jericho, cried aloud to this man—"If it be lawful to call him a man"⁴—and besought him to restore sight to the empty sockets of his eyeballs, whereupon this man or demigod, whose name is Jesus, touched his eyes, sight being immediately given to the formerly blind beggar, who proceeded to walk with perfect vision and to mingle with us, showing us his perfect organs of sight and filling the air with his joyous clamors.

That on another occasion a notorious leper, whose disease had advanced to the confluent stage, where he was covered with the sores which proclaim a man a walking corpse, called out to him, "Lord," for so he addressed him, "if you want to you can cure me," whereupon this man or son of the gods went to him with prompt compas-

² Paine's Age of Reason, in re Virgin birth.

³ Gibbon Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.

⁴ Josephus.

sion, laid his hand without hesitation on the leper's filthy sores and said, "I will; be thou clean," the complete curing of the victim of this incurable disease being evidenced by the entire disappearance of his scabs and sores, the restoration of the disease-rotted fingers and foot and the change of his scabby and ulcerous skin to a state of almost infant-like smoothness and pinkness of texture. The cure of this man and of ten lepers who similarly applied to this miracle worker for help has been confirmed by our correspondents who interviewed the priests at the Jewish Temple at Jerusalem, to whom the restored patients applied for a certification of restoration to health and a right again to mingle with other men.

Among other events reported by our correspondent, selecting only a few from the long list reported by him as having taken place in his personal presence, in touching distance of the persons dealt with, in the presence of a large crowd of other onlookers, many of whom, in spite of strong prejudice against and antipathy to the Galilean, now proclaim their belief that this man is the Messiah long looked for by the Jews and none other than the Son of God Himself, was the stopping by him of a funeral procession from the town of Nain, and the raising to life from the bier the son of a certain widow who was being carried to burial. While the thought occurs, of course, that the young man might have been not really dead but only in such a trance as has, we have sad reason to believe, caused the interment of more than one human being while life was still in them, inquiry by our correspondent of the physicians who attended the young man in his illness elicited the most positive statement that the patient was unquestionably dead, as confirmed by the various tests taken by him to make sure life was extinct.

But probably the most remarkable event reported by our Near East correspondent is that of the raising of a gentleman of wealth and prominence in the Town of Bethany, by the name of Lazarus, whose tomb this man or god named Jesus ordered opened, although the man had been buried four days and the members of his family naturally expressed their shrinking horror of exposing the senses and nerves of these present and the corpse of their dead relative to the affront to eyes and nostrils which man's great enemy death brings to pass after four days of decay. The stone being rolled away, however, in deference to the categorical order of the Galilean, he stood in front of the low door to the tomb and spoke certain words to some unseen being whom he addressed as his Father and then called a distinct command to the dead man within: "Lazarus, come forth." And our correspondent avers on his word as a Roman that forthwith there came forth from the door of the tomb the man who had been dead, wrapped hand in foot by the grave clothes, so that the bystanders' first task was to unwind the long linen shroud by which his limbs were confined.

Our correspondent writes that he finds it difficult to believe even what he saw with his own eyes, but that he has interviewed the resur-

rected dead man again and again at his own home, been hospitably invited to dine with him and his sisters, and that there is no more possibility of mistaking the man's present life and animation than there was his death and advanced state of putrefication when the confined air of his tomb was released by opening the door.

As can be readily understood, such events as these have raised the most extravagant ideas among the residents of Jerusalem and surrounding country, many of whom declare that this man is evidently the supernatural being the Jewish Scriptures—from which our own Delphic Oracles have not hesitated to borrow from time to time in connection with their prediction of future events—have foretold for many centuries past and which our writers have also predicted with direful foreboding that there should arise out of Palestine a great being who would wrest the world's sceptre from our own nation and assume it on behalf of the Jewish race.

The Jewish leaders and the royal governor, Herod, however, mock at these claims made on behalf of this Jewish wonder worker and we may take comfort in the thought that it would take greater power than that manifested by the curing of a few Galilean blind and cripples and raising even some Jewish dead * to overcome the mighty Roman cohorts and accomplish what the great Hannibal and Mithridates failed to do.

It seems furthermore that the Galilean himself makes no pretense to the crown of the Herods, even, and avers that while he is a supernatural being and the promised Messiah of the Jews, his kingdom is of the world beyond the grave, which claims to sovereignty in Hades, it may safely be surmised our sovereign lord, the Emperor Tiberius, may he live forever, will have little inclination to dispute. He further is reported to have said that he came not to rule but to minister unto others and "to give his life a ransom for many," words inexplicable on any theory, except on that of some sort of frenzy or mental upset. This theory, however, seems utterly untenable in view of the supernatural powers exercised by the man and the terse and sober wisdom and profundity of his discourses and debates with the Jewish Scribes and Pharisees, whose deadly enmity he seems to have incurred as a result of the humiliating defeats they have suffered in their efforts to get the better of him in dialectic discourses, and his denunciation of them as being, what all Romans have long believed, mere hypocrites and racketeers, using their religion and the superstition of the Jewish people for their own personal aggrandizement.

A verbatim report of certain of this man's speeches, parables and epigrammatic sayings will be found on page 44 of this edition of the *Recorder*, and however accounted for, it is the opinion of the writer that neither the discourses of Socrates, Plato or Seneca himself can

* Conceded to have been done by the Roman Emperor Julian and by the Jewish Talmud.

equal them for depth of thought, perspicacity, terseness, which we Romans regard as the sum of all literary virtues, and a certain indefinable tone of personal authority and confidence, over a substratum of apparent utter lack of personal pride or ambition.

The next dispatch from our correspondent will be awaited with keen interest and, in the meantime, let all thoughtful men among us ponder the phenomena reported to us. The *Recorder* welcomes communications from its readers expressing their views about the "astonishing things reported to us."

ROME EVENING RECORDER

LATEST NEWS FROM GALILEE

The latest dispatch from Palestine conveys strange news to us, indeed, and news not uncoupled from disappointment and disillusionment of the high hopes some of the more devout amongst us may have entertained that at long last we had authentic information that "the gods had come down to us in the likeness of a man." At the same time the information we now have will doubtless prove of considerable assurance to the government, which will not, as some had begun to believe, have to enter into the foredoomed-to-failure struggle for world empire with a supernatural being, as was so feared in the time of the Emperor Pompey that, as some now living doubtless remember, a decree was entered that every infant born in that year was to be put to death, lest he prove to be the fulfillment of the prophecy that at that time would be born the man who was to overthrow our mighty empire.

The dispatch which has just come to our desk from Maxentius Publius is that the remarkable Galilean named Jesus, whose allegedly supernatural actions were reported in the edition of this paper of three weeks ago, is dead, having been executed by his excellency the Governor Pontius Pilate at the instigation and even insistence of the leaders of the Jews at Jerusalem, who have manifested their loyalty to the Emperor by themselves asking for the removal of the man of their race who claimed to be, they said, their rightful king, thus, as they feared, endangering the safety of the nation by exposing it to a punitive expedition by the legions of the department of Asia Minor, under the command of General Cestius Gallus.

If we had a bewildering puzzle to solve when confronted with the record of miraculous deeds done by one who was to all appearances a mere human being, we now have an even greater one to account for in the apparent helplessness of the man who was reported to have stopped a storm on Lake Galilee by a word of command and who exercised authority to call back from the pale realm of the shades three persons who had crossed the gloomy Styx, when he himself was arrested and subjected to all possible insults and abuse in the course of a trial for blasphemy and treason and finally executed in that manner

which, of course, a publication which enters the refined homes of the Roman nobility will not offend against etiquette by even mentioning.

The man apparently had supernatural power to relieve every manner of disease and distress of others, but it would seem he was utterly unable to deliver himself from abuse and torture at the hands of fellow mortals. Let those who pride themselves on their power to think through difficult problems exercise their profound intellects on this one and send to the editor their conclusions. The dilemma was expressed by some of those who witnessed the Galilean's execution, our reporters tell us, who said "He saved others, himself he cannot save," and they challenged him "If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross (with due apologies for using the term) and we will believe on you."

To these taunts, however, we are told the dying man made no response whatever, his reticence in this connection being of a part with the silent dignity, tinged with contempt, our reporter thought, who was present at the trial, with which he stood before both the Jewish Sanhedrin and Governor Pontius Pilate, who reports in the official transcript he has sent of the trial of this remarkable man, that he took him into his private chambers in order that he might interrogate the prisoner more freely, as a result of a superstitious fear, he admits he felt that he might indeed be dealing with one of the immortal gods, little as he had been inclined to believe such beings had ever walked among mortal men.

Our reporter, who in spite of the horror of such an experience, remained from beginning to end of the execution of the Galilean, reports incidents as difficult as those heretofore recited to fit into any theory of the real character and identity of the condemned man. He writes that he endured the agony of the form of death inflicted upon him without a word of complaint; that he addressed a petition to some unseen Being for pardon for those who carried out the sentence of execution on the ground that they did not realize what they were doing; that when reviled by one of the two thieves crucified with him he made no more response than he did to the jibes of his Jewish compatriots who were parading up and down before his cross, but that a half hour later, when one of these fellow sufferers addressed an appeal to him which indicated that he, the thief, really believed that the Galilean's career was not now ended on the gibbet but that he would, as he had declared, even rise from the dead and be a king after all, and asked that he be remembered when he should "come to his kingdom," the dying Galilean responded with words which indicated that all the suffering and bloodletting he had endured had not altered his illusion that he was indeed a king of some kind and of some world, for he replied to this appeal with the words, Quote: "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

A short time thereafter, our correspondent writes, the dying man said, "I thirst," whereupon one of the executioners, touched with

compassion apparently, tendered the victim a sponge filled with vinegar, of which he partook, though, strange to relate, he had utterly refused to drink the stupefying drug provided by certain ladies of Jerusalem, and which our merciful law allows those about to be crucified to take to abate somewhat the intolerable and lingering pangs of death by crucifixion. Immediately after drinking of the vinegar the man said, "Father, into thy hands I place my spirit," and thereupon by an action which was obviously under his own control, bowed his head upon his breast and apparently dismissed his spirit from him.

Our reporter writes that it was at this moment when the terrific and destructive earthquake which convulsed the province of Galilee rocked the earth so violently that as all know our city itself felt the tremors, and that it was during the last hour that this man was alive upon the cross, that the great darkness came over the sun which has so puzzled our astronomers and scientific men, since it was not, of course, the time for any solar eclipse.

The centurion in charge of carrying out the sentence of the court, our reporter writes, was greatly impressed by the unusual manner of this man's dying, utterly unlike that of any of the scores of criminals it had been his distressing duty to put to death, and remarked in the hearing of all those present, "Surely this man was the son of God," certainly a strange conclusion to come to about a man who had given the fullest proof of impotency to deliver himself, as an immortal god would assuredly have done and been able to do, from such humiliation and suffering as was inflicted upon him.

And now the strange things which have come to our press room have been faithfully reported to our readers, and the editor is frank to say that no one who reads of them can be more bewildered and unable to account for them than he is himself.

ROME EVENING RECORDER

FLASH! LATEST NEWS FROM GALILEE CRUCIFIED JESUS RISES FROM DEAD!

Jerusalem agog with excitement over rumor that the Nazarene crucified three days before had arisen from the tomb of the wealthy and prominent Joseph of Arimathea, where he had been buried, and appeared to many of his friends.

Of all the strange events ever to be reported, certainly the strangest is now set forth by our Palestine correspondent, whose news flashes for the last three years have caused a mingling of mocking disbelief and anxious foreboding on the part of the citizens of Rome.

It will be remembered that a few weeks ago the trial, condemnation and execution of the Galilean wonder man was reported as having taken place under circumstances of city-wide publicity.

At the time much bewilderment had been felt and widely expressed at such an ignominious and incongruous end to the career of a being who possessed and exercised such supernatural powers.

And now comes the strange denouement:

The man is reported to have come back to life and to be walking among his followers in and about Jerusalem, having talked with them and even eaten with them, two or three at a time, twelve of his close followers at another time, with certain women of his acquaintance and even with as many as five hundred apparently sane and responsible citizens at once.

Among those reporting their contact with him, it will be noted, are none of the priests nor the governor who condemned him, which is a circumstance throwing the cloud of suspicion over this latest remarkable event reported about him; for surely had the Galilean been the supernatural being he claimed to be, with power indeed to return from the grave, would not his most imperative impulse have been to display himself before the Sanhedrin which condemned him, those rulers of the people who mocked at his dying and especially, and most suitably of all, to the governor, the august representative of the Roman Empire itself?

Our reporter, the most excellent Maxentius Publius, has stressed this fact, with his usual caution in analyzing news and with the skill that has made him the most highly paid columnist in the world, but he has gone on to suggest a line of thought that sounds strange indeed coming from a man of the world so little given to having his mental processes clouded by emotion.

Publius asks whether it can be possible that the Galilean's claim of royal rank in a higher world can account for his apparent indifference to the relative dignity of men of this world and his freedom from such frail human emotions as a desire to vindicate his rank and dignity in the eyes of those enemies for whom by words and by silent contempt at his trial he manifested such complete indifference. We pass on this idea for what it is worth, if anything.

But a further item in our dispatch merits serious attention, and that is that certain close friends and followers of the executed man are now performing in Jerusalem miracles as unmistakable as those performed by their leader himself by merely using the name of the dead, and, as they allege, now again alive man. It is reported that following the instant healing of a notorious lame beggar at Jerusalem who, utterly without expectation of anything miraculous, had merely asked for a denarius, great crowds immediately gathered about a Galilean fisherman named Simon Peter, who proceeded to harangue the crowd and declare that he had wrought this miracle merely by using the name of the one they had caused to be put to death.

It should be reported also that a short time previously to this incident an apparently supernatural phenomenon had appeared in the form of bright lights or small tongues of some sort of flame which

flickered over the heads of certain people who had gathered into a meeting to talk together about the strange things they unitedly believed they had seen and heard, whereupon these men each and all began to preach to the crowd which quickly assembled and, although ignorant and unlettered men, in the many foreign tongues of the polyglot assembly gathered at that time in Jerusalem from all corners of the Empire. As a result of this strange occurrence and especially of a speech made by one of them, the aforementioned Simon Peter, as many as 3,000 of the men and women gathered together publicly proclaimed that they believed what the speaker declared in regard to the resurrection of the man whom he charged them with hounding to death and abjectly called on the unseen God of heaven to forgive them for what they regarded and now confessed to have been a great crime.

These unusual events have caused considerable turmoil in the always excitable and turbulent city of the Jews, whose rulers now find themselves confronted with the danger of a great uprising of the people against them as having caused the death of their promised Messiah and the extinguishment of the hope the Jewish nation had entertained for many centuries of restoration to the power and glory of the early history of Israel.

These are strange days in which we live and certainly if the gods do have compassion upon the race of mankind, there have never been times in which their interposition on its behalf has been more needed. Let us wait to see what comes of this matter, for if it was of man it will come to naught, but if indeed the great Father of men and gods has begun to deal with the earth and to bring back the long promised Golden Age, He will not "fail nor be discouraged" until He has brought righteousness and peace and joy to us again.

Let us remember the words of our great poet Virgil:

"Jam nova progenies Coelo demittur alto"

(Now a new progeny from heaven descends)

Cara Deum Soboles, magnum Jovis incrementum

(Dear offspring of the Gods, great Son of Jove)

Aspice con vexo nutantem pondere mundum

Terasq. tractusq., maris, coelumq. profundum

Aspice venturo laetentus ut omnia seculo

(Lo, teeming nature, bending with its load,

The earth, the ocean and the heavens high,

Behold how all rejoice to greet the coming age.)

CONSECRATION DEED

THIS DEED, made this.....day of....., Anno Domini....., by and between....., party of the first part, and the Lord Jesus Christ, the "only Potentate, King of kings and Lord of lords," Party of the second part,

WITNESSETH that, in consideration of the grant of remission of sins, of eternal life and felicity in the world to come, and pardon, peace, power and provision for all needs in the life that now is, and in remembrance of the broken body and shed blood of the Party of the second part, thus dealt with in the interest and behalf of the party of the first part, the said party of the first part does hereby GIVE, GRANT and CONVEY unto the said Party of the second part all right, title and interest in and to....., together with all the talents, powers, faculties and possessions belonging or in any wise appertaining to the said party of the first part,

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the said party of the first part, with all appurtenances to.....belonging, to the sole use and behoof of the Party of the second part in fee simple absolute and forever.

AND the party of the first part does hereby covenant and agree to make such further verbal assurances of this transfer as may from time to time be necessary to assure the Party of the second part of full and quiet possession of the party of the first part.

WITNESS the hand and seal of the party of the first part this day and year hereinbefore written.

(Seal)

State of
County of
SS:

We, the undersigned, who have confessed and do hereby confess Jesus Christ as our Lord and believe in our hearts that God raised Him from the dead, do hereby certify that....., party to a certain act and deed of consecration bearing date the.....day of.....A. D.....and hereto annexed, personally appeared before us in the State and County aforesaid, the said.....being personally well known to us to be the person who executed said deed, and acknowledged the same to be.....full, free, voluntary and deliberate act and deed.

Name
Address
Name
Address

(To be acknowledged as the free act and deed of the party of the first part in the presence of two good and lawful witnesses, members of the household of faith, who should subscribe their names at the places indicated above therefor.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

IS THE HIGHER CRITICISM SCHOLARLY A SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT	Robert Dick Wilson
PICTURES OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH	Robert Dick Wilson
EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY	Sir Wm. Ramsay
GOD THE ARCHITECT	Chas. P. McIlvaine
ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF MAN	Arthur I. Brown
EARTH'S EARLIEST AGES	George Frederick Wright
SECRET OF THE UNIVERSE	G. H. Pember
THE SANHEDRIN VERDICT	Nathan R. Wood
THE COMING PRINCE	I. H. Linton
GOD AND YOU	Sir Robt. Anderson
PROGRESS OF DOCTRINE	Arthur I. Brown, M. D.
PLAIN REASONS AGAINST JOINING THE CHURCH OF ROME	Thomas Dehany Barnard
REPLY TO LITTLEDALE'S PLAIN REASONS (presenting viewpoint)	R. F. Littledale Catholic
WONDERS OF PROPHECY	H. L. D. Ryder
THEISM AND ANTI-THEISTIC THEORIES	John Urquhart
Q. E. D.	Robert Flint
HISTORY OF SOME SCIENTIFIC BLUNDERS	Geo. McCready Price
DIVINE HUMAN IN THE SCRIPTURES	Geo. McCready Price
ABRAHAM LINCOLN THE CHRISTIAN	Taylor Lewis
WATSON'S APOLOGY FOR CHRISTIANITY	Wm. J. Johnson
LESLIE'S SHORT AND EASY METHOD WITH THE DEISTS	Richard Watson
CAMPBELL'S DISSERTATION ON MIRACLES	Charles Leslie
SHERLOCK'S TRIAL OF THE WITNESSES	George Campbell
	Thomas Sherlock

Other Helpful Books for Further Reading

AFTER ITS KIND, by Byron C. Nelson, Th. M.
ANALOGY OF RELIGION, by Bishop Joseph Butler
ASTRONOMICAL DISCOURSES, by Chalmers
BIBLE AND ITS CHRIST, THE, by R. A. Torrey, D. D.
BIBLE UNDER FIRE, THE, by John L. Campbell, D. D.
CASE AGAINST EVOLUTION, THE, by George Barry O'Toole, Ph. D., S. T. D.
CAUSE AND CURE OF INFIDELITY, by David Nelson
CHRISTIAN CARTOONS, by E. J. Pace, D. D.
COLLAPSE OF EVOLUTION, THE, by J. T. Townsend
CONVERSION OF SAINT PAUL, by George Lyttleton, and RESURRECTION OF CHRIST, by Gilbert West, one volume

DIFFICULTIES AND ALLEGED ERRORS AND CONTRADICTIONS IN THE
BIBLE, by R. A. Torrey, D. D.

DOGMA OF EVOLUTION, THE, by Louis Trenchard Moore

EVIDENCES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, by Archibald Alexander

EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, by Mark Hopkins

EVOLUTION, AN INVESTIGATION AND A CRITICISM, by Th. Graebner

EVOLUTION AND THE SUPERNATURAL, by W. H. Griffith Thomas

EVOLUTION AT THE BAR, by Philip Mauro

EVOLUTION DISPROVED, by Wm. A. Williams

GRACE ABOUNDING, combined with PILGRIM'S PROGRESS, by John
Bunyan

HORAE PAULINAE, by William Paley

HOW I KNOW GOD ANSWERS PRAYER, by Rosalind Goforth

INTERNAL EVIDENCES, by Thomas Erskine

JOCKO-HOMO, THE TOADSTOOL AMONG THE TOOMBS, PUDDLE TO
PARADISE, by B. H. Shadduck, Ph. D.

LESLIE'S FOUR MARKS, A SHORT AND EASY METHOD WITH THE
DEISTS, by Charles Leslie

MODERN TRIANGLE, THE, by S. J. Bole

NATURAL THEOLOGY, by Wm. Paley

OTHER SIDE OF EVOLUTION, THE, by Alexander Patterson

PHANTOM OF ORGANIC EVOLUTION, THE, by Geo. McCready Price

ROGER'S REASONS NO. 2, by John Urquhart

SCIENTIFIC MAN AND THE BIBLE, THE, by Howard A. Kelly, M. D.

TESTIMONY OF THE EVANGELISTS, by Simon Greenleaf.

THEOPNEUSTIA, by L. Gaussen

TWICE BORN MEN, by Harold Begbie

EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, by Wm. Paley

A SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE, by Leander S. Keyser, with exten-
sive bibliography.

DIVINE UNITY OF THE SCRIPTURE, by Adolph Sapphir

MANY INFALLIBLE PROOFS, by Arthur T. Pierson

DIFFICULTIES OF THE EVOLUTION THEORY, by D. Dewar

SCIENTIFIC CONFIRMATION OF OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY, by Geo.
Frederick Wright

A DOUBTER'S DOUBTS ABOUT SCIENCE AND RELIGION, by R. Ander-
son

\$3.95

5565-2

A Lawyer Examines the Bible **A Defense of the Christian Faith**

IRWIN H. LINTON

Foreword by Tim LaHaye

Irwin Linton claims that those who do not believe the Bible have not honestly examined the evidence. He contends that just as "a man who studies and uses the multiplication table knows it is true; (so) a man who studies and uses the Bible knows it is true. It can be proved theoretically, and it proves itself empirically."

And so, Linton presents a case for the Bible and for Christianity, using his experience as a lawyer to examine the evidence thoroughly and logically. He relies on the classic apologies of the Christian faith — Archdeacon Paley's **Evidences** among them — to dismiss the arguments of Gibbon, Hume, Voltaire, and Ingersoll.

Linton documents many of his own confrontations with fellow lawyers, atheists, and other unbelievers, and concludes that the evidence for Christianity is overwhelming:

"The logical, historical . . . proofs of . . . Christianity are so indisputable that I have found them to arrest the surprised attention of just about every man to whom I have presented them. . . ."

Irwin H. Linton was a successful lawyer in Washington, D.C., and represented cases before the Supreme Court of the United States.

BAKER BOOK HOUSE
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Canada: G. R. Welch Co., Toronto

South Africa: Word of Life Wholesale, Johannesburg

Australia: S. John Bacon Pty. Ltd., Melbourne

New Zealand: G. W. Moore Ltd., Auckland

Japan: Christian Literature Crusade, Tokyo

Singapore: Scripture Union Christian Book Centre